

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXVII.]

SEPTEMBER, 1854.

[VOL. X.

MAHON'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.*

WITH this volume Lord Mahon has concluded, at least for the present, his labours on the History of England during the eighteenth century. Attracted, in the first instance, to the war of the Spanish Succession by the military fame of his ancestor, General Stanhope, of whose exploits his own title is an honourable record, he has been led on, through the reigns of the Brunswick family, to the separation of the American Colonies. Beginning with Marlborough and Eugene, he thus ends with Burgoyne and Cornwallis,—a contrast not very flattering to national pride, nor affording any great support to that marked preference of Tory over Whig administration, which is so conspicuous in his History. His work is a valuable accession to our historical literature. He has used carefully all the published authorities and documents, and, from his social and official position, has obtained access to many curious materials of history which had not been previously employed. Lord Mahon is evidently a candid and amiable man, not wholly free from prejudices of class and party; a friend to intellectual progress, though rather anxious lest the world should travel too fast for the church; tolerant in religion, but holding Dissenters in slight estimation. His narrative is easy and pleasant, without any extraordinary power,† and his reflections just and useful, though commonly such as the reader would have made without difficulty for him-

* History of England from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles, 1713—1783. By Lord Mahon. In Seven Volumes. Vol. VII. 1853.

† Where his Lordship attempts a loftier style he is not always successful. The following sentence closes his account of the failure of the Spanish attack on Gibraltar in 1782: "Thus did the Pillars of Hercules, so conspicuous as emblems on the device of the Emperor Charles V., with their ancient motto, NEC PLUS ULTRA, and borne by him upon his banners in the wars against King Francis I., now in British hands baffle and beat back all the endeavours of the heirs of Charles V. and Francis I. combined." (VII. 290.) Perhaps his Lordship had Sampson in his mind when he spoke of *pillars* being in *British hands*; but Sampson did not employ them to "beat back" the Philistines. We have seldom read a more uncouth sentence than the following: "Far superior to Arthur Young—superior as the researches of a Newton are above, though supporting and supported by, the observations of an Astronomical Table—stands the name of Adam Smith." (VII. 496.) His looseness of phrase sometimes approaches a *bullet*. Thus he tells us (VI. 480) that the late Earl of Liverpool, finding himself once the sole visitor at a dinner of the Literary Club, "ordered a bottle of Madeira, of which he took a very moderate *share*."

self. Lord Mahon will never take rank with our great historians, but he gives us fairly and agreeably the history of the times of which he treats, and is not likely to be displaced till Mr. Macaulay fulfils the long-deferred expectation of the public.

Lord Mahon's work would have maintained more of that impartial tone which should characterize history, had it not been composed in great measure during the progress of the mighty struggle of parties and principles which, beginning with Catholic Emancipation, has ended with the establishment of Free Trade. There are evident traces of the influence of passing events, in which he was himself engaged and deeply interested, upon his narrative of former times; sometimes in direct reflections, unfavourable to the contemporary party to which he has been opposed; sometimes in the manner of presenting facts so as to suggest censure on contemporaries, without directly naming them. It is evident, however, that Lord Mahon has not lived through the changes of the last thirty years, without being cured of some of the prepossessions with which he began his History, and that he has dropped from a Tory to a moderate Conservative. This change is conspicuous in regard to Free Trade. When he spoke of the Treaty of Utrecht, and the Commercial Treaty with France which should have been its supplement, he praised the Parliament which rejected that wise measure, for following the advice of practical men in opposition to theorists. In the review of literature which closes his seventh volume, he adopts Dr. Johnson's rebuke of the shallow criticism of Sir John Pringle on the Wealth of Nations, that an author who had never been in trade could not be expected to write well on that subject, any more than a lawyer upon physic; "on the contrary, there is nothing, said Johnson" (in a true statesman's spirit, observes Lord Mahon), "which requires more to be illustrated by philosophy than trade does."

The beginning of the year 1780 was remarkable for the commencement of a movement in the nation in favour of Economical Reform, in which the county of York, with Sir George Savile and its Whig aristocracy, took a leading part. The shameless profusion with which pensions were lavished, the multitude of sinecures which were the ready reward of political subserviency, the accumulated debts of the Civil List, naturally excited the murmurs of the people, who were heavily taxed for the maintenance of a war, which was undertaken, indeed, with their zealous concurrence, but which had brought as little glory as profit. Lord Mahon thus describes the presentation of the Yorkshire petition by Sir George, and its support by Burke:

"The great Yorkshire petition was presented to the Commons, on the 8th of February, by the principal Yorkshire member Sir George Savile. On that occasion, as the forms of the House did not yet prohibit, Savile delivered a speech in its support. His slender figure and his feeble voice

(then especially he was suffering from hoarseness) seemed to expand, and his delicate frame to gather strength, from the magnitude of the interests confided to his charge; and his brother members, preserving an unbroken silence, shewed him all the attention and respect due to a character so upright and unsullied. Three days later, Burke brought forward the motion that he had announced on Economical Reform. His speech, as shortly afterwards it was revised and published by himself, may deserve to rank among the highest of his oratorical productions. 'One of the ablest speeches I have ever heard,' said Lord North in reply; 'a speech such as no other member could have made.' Here the brilliant hues of fancy impart form and colour even to the dry bones of financial calculation. Here the very details of the Exchequer grow amusing. Thus lightly, for example, does Burke play on the defects of the five lesser sovereign jurisdictions of the realm: 'Ours is not a monarchy in strictness; but as in the Saxon times this country was an heptarchy, so now it is a strange sort of pentarchy....Cross a brook, and you lose the King of England; but you have some comfort in coming again under His Majesty, though shorn of his beams, and no more than Prince of Wales. Go to the north, and you find him dwindled to a Duke of Lancaster; turn to the west of that north, and he pops upon you in the humble character of Earl of Chester. Travel a few miles on, the Earl of Chester disappears, and the King surprises you again as Count Palatine of Lancaster. If you travel beyond Mount Edgecombe you find him once more in his incognito, and he is Duke of Cornwall. So that, quite fatigued and satiated with this dull variety, you are infinitely refreshed when you return to the sphere of his proper splendour, and behold your amiable Sovereign in his true, simple, undisguised, native character of Majesty.'

"Burke proposed that these five lesser jurisdictions should be wholly swept away. 'When the reason of old establishments is gone'—thus with the truest Conservative wisdom he spoke on another branch of his subject—'it is absurd to keep nothing but the burthen of them. This is superstitiously to embalm a carcase not worth an ounce of the gums that are used to preserve it.'”—VII. 5, 6.

Though the plan of Economical Reform met with the support of the House of Commons at first, notwithstanding the opposition of Lord North, that support gradually dwindled away, and the Bill was lost, to be renewed with considerable modifications by the Rockingham Administration in 1782. Its failure at this time was not owing to any secret dealings of the Court. An election was impending, and many Members who were anxious to stand well with their constituents, having gained this point by their support of the principle of economy, were glad to have an opportunity of quietly getting rid of the Bill by less conspicuous votes in Committee against its most effective provisions. But there was another reason. It had been made a party measure, and the supporters of Government were alarmed at the advantage which they had given to their opponents by voting in its favour. Besides, the events of the Civil War had left behind a great dread of the erection of an independent power in Parliament, and, both

on this occasion and on that of the Coalition in 1783-4, an attempt to concentrate power in the House of Commons has brought defeat on the party which undertook it. Dunning carried by a majority of eighteen, in this session, his famous resolution, that "the influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished;" but when he moved an address, requesting the King "neither to prorogue nor dissolve the Parliament till measures had been taken to diminish the influence of the Crown," he suddenly found himself in a minority of fifty-one. The whole matter was soon forgotten amidst the excitement of Lord George Gordon's riots, and the next great movement for Economical Reform was accompanied by an energetic demonstration for the Reform of Parliament, in favour of which Sir George Savile presented a petition from Yorkshire, to which, not, as before, 8000, but 30,000 signatures were attached.

Meanwhile, the American War continued, with a diminishing prospect of success to England. Whatever chance of the reduction of the revolted provinces might previously have existed, was entirely destroyed by the arrival of the French auxiliaries under the Count de Rochambeau. The following year (1781) witnessed the surrender of Cornwallis at York-town. The effect of the news on the Prime Minister and Sovereign of England is thus described :

"The intelligence of the York-town capitulation reached London about noon on the 25th of November. Lord George Germaine, who first received it as Secretary of State, hastened to impart it in person to the Prime Minister, and, by letter, to the King. Mr. Wraxall, as it chanced, dined with Lord George that very day, and then asked him how Lord North took the communication? 'As he would have taken a cannon-ball in his breast,' replied Lord George. 'He opened his arms, exclaiming wildly, as he paced up and down the room for a few minutes, 'Oh God! it is all over!' words which he repeated many times under the deepest agitation and distress.'

"Far greater was the fortitude shown by George the Third. His Majesty's reply to the communication from Lord George Germaine was received that same afternoon: it was neither tremulous in its handwriting, nor yet despondent in its tone; it expressed his deep concern, but, at the same time, his steady resolution. There was only one little circumstance which to Lord George's practised eye betrayed unwonted emotion. In that letter the King had omitted to mark the hour and minute of his writing, as he was accustomed to do with scrupulous exactness."—VII. 185, 186.

The following are Lord Mahon's reflections on this event :

"With the surrender of Lord Cornwallis, the American War may be said to have concluded; so far at least as its active military operations were concerned. It was a war by no means, as we sometimes hear alleged of it, founded on any plain or palpable injustice in point of law, since at the outset, when the taxes were first imposed, the English Ministers might point to nearly all the highest authorities as affirming

the abstract right of taxation we possessed. But, beyond all doubt, it was a war proceeding on the grossest impolicy, from the moment it was seen how much resentment the exercise of that right provoked. For the mere barren assertion of that right—for a mere peppercorn of rent—we alienated, and, as it were, in wantonness, flung from us provinces which, at the peace of 1763, had been as contented and loyal as the shires along the Severn or the Thames. We grew wiser, but too late. Earnest and more earnest overtures, larger and then larger concessions, were tendered, from time to time, to the uprisen Colonies, but always a few weeks or a few months beyond the period when they might yet have healed the wound. The same utter want of policy which provoked the war was shown in its first direction. Our most skilful commanders, our most daring enterprises, seemed to be reserved for the conclusion of the conflict, when skill could no more avail us, and when enterprise led only to disaster. While the opportunity was still ours—while France and Spain, so soon to combine against us, still kept aloof—while Washington's army, for example, was in full flight, or Gates's was not yet formed, then it is that we find General Howe content to bound his conquests at the Delaware, and General Burgoyne refrain a whole month from his advance to Albany. Such was the system in the Cabinet, against which our greatest statesmen warned the Ministry in vain. Such were the errors in the field which even the occasional skill of our officers, and the constant bravery of our troops, could not retrieve. Thus did we alienate a people with whom we might perhaps, to this very day, have kept united; with them resolutely upholding peace among all other nations; with them, the leaders of the world in temperate liberty and Christian progress. They might have been both our brother freemen and our fellow subjects, free with their own Assemblies as we are free with ours, yet bound to us beneath the golden circle of the Crown. Or if even, with their growing numbers, that golden circle had seemed to them to press, it might have been gently and quietly unloosed. We might have parted as friends and kinsmen part, not have torn asunder with a bleeding gash on either side.”—VII. 183—185.

There must be always much uncertainty in speculations contrasting what has been, which we know, with what might have been, which we can only guess at. America, we believe, has done much more for “Christian progress” as an independent power, than she would ever have done as a dependency of England. In regard to “temperate liberty,” the case is more doubtful. A large deduction from the favourable effects of the emancipation of the Colonies on the cause of freedom in Europe must be made, in consequence of the excessive admiration of republicanism which the example of America produced on this side of the Atlantic. This gave rise to the first and the last French republic; to this we may trace the numerous abortive attempts at establishing similar forms of government in other parts of Europe,—attempts more fatal to the cause of temperate liberty than long years of monarchical misrule; this keeps alive in the minds of many ardent continental patriots a visionary hope of overthrowing monarchy, and makes them refuse all compromise with existing

governments. We may also doubt whether “the golden circle of the Crown”—a phrase borrowed from O’Connell—would have been more efficacious in regard to America than to Ireland, in maintaining even a modified dependence. Suppose that England, awaking to the enormities of slavery, had proposed to deal with Virginia and the Carolinas as she dealt with Jamaica and Barbadoes,—would they have tolerated such an interference with their peculiar institutions?

The events of the American War bring prominently into view the character of George the Third, whose determined adherence to the policy of carrying it on, caused it to be protracted a considerable time after his Prime Minister, Lord North, had become convinced that the attempt was hopeless. The publication of the *Grenville Papers*, the *Memoirs of Lord Rockingham* and *Mr. Fox*, have laid open the whole course of Parliamentary faction and Court intrigue, during the years that intervened from the King’s accession to the appointment of Mr. Pitt. We do not think that the character of the King suffers by the disclosures which these works contain, when we separate the facts from the opinions which their writers formed under the influence of personal and party feeling. George III. had been most unfortunate in his early education. He had too faithfully remembered “the law of his mother,” who had for ever repeated to him, “George be a King,” but had forgotten to teach him what were the high duties of Royalty. His education, as she herself confessed, had been miserably neglected; and those who were placed about him in early life were men of such notoriously arbitrary principles of government, as to have given rise to a remonstrance on the part of many eminent persons of the Whig party in the year 1752. On one occasion, as she told Mr. Dodington, she had desired his preceptor, Mr. Stone, to inform the Prince “about the Constitution,” but he declined to do it, for fear of giving jealousy to the Bishop of Norwich; and when she mentioned it again, he declined it as not being his province. Upon Dodington’s inquiry, “Pray, Madam, what is his province?” the Princess replied, “She did not know, unless it was to go before the Prince up stairs, to walk with him sometimes, seldom to ride with him, and now and then to dine with him.” His constitutional education, thus shamefully neglected by his preceptors, he received no doubt in ample measure from Lord Bute; and though this nobleman was removed from his councils after he came to the throne, and though the suspicion, long entertained, that he governed by secret advice years after he had ceased to be a Minister, has not been warranted by any subsequent evidence, the spirit of his counsels remained deeply infused into the mind of his pupil. He came to the throne with the fixed purpose of weakening and destroying that combination of Whig families which had kept his grandfather in thraldom, and forced him to accept Ministries most distasteful to him.

Notwithstanding his Jacobite education, we do not believe that George III. ever entertained a desire to infringe the Constitution; and it would be a very partial view of the case between him and the Whigs, to treat it as a struggle between popular principles and arbitrary government. During the greater part of the 18th century, a game for power was playing between the Crown and them,—the Crown supported by its prerogatives and the natural leanings of aristocracy; the Whig party by popular principles, but also, in a great degree, it must be remembered, by borough influence obtained in an illegal manner. In this struggle George III. suffered occasional and short defeats, but on the whole he was triumphant, and really, though unintentionally, contributed to the advance of a more truly popular freedom. He has been accused of duplicity in his dealings with his Whig Administrations. There is abundant evidence of the cunning with which he availed himself of the state of parties and the jealousies of individuals to carry his own plans; but no breach of his word has ever been established against him; and certainly he never succeeded, if he made the attempt, in persuading any Whig Administration that he was cordially attached to them. The general voice of the country supported him at the commencement of the American War; and when we recollect that Chatham's dying speech was delivered in opposition to American Independence, we shall not be inclined very severely to condemn the Sovereign who resisted, while it was possible to resist, the dismemberment of his hereditary dominions.

But whatever opinion may be entertained of his political principles and conduct, we think every reader will sympathize with his feelings as a father, as disclosed in the affecting letters to Bishop Hurd, now published, we believe, for the first time (Appendix, pp. xxxv, xxxvi).

“Windsor, August 20, 1782.

“MY GOOD LORD,

“There is no probability, and, indeed, scarce a possibility, that my youngest child* can survive this day. The knowing you are acquainted with the tender feelings of the Queen's heart, convinces me you will be uneasy till apprised that she is calling the only solid assistant under affliction—religion—to her assistance.

“She feels the peculiar goodness of Divine Providence, in never having before put her to so severe a trial, though she has so numerous a family. I do not deny (that) I also write to you, my good Lord, as a balm to my mind. As I have not you present to converse with, I think it the most pleasing occupation by this means to convey to you, that I place my confidence that the Almighty will never fill my cup of sorrow fuller than I can bear; and when I reflect on the dear cause of our tribulation, I consider his change to be so greatly for his advantage, that I sometimes think it unkind to wish his recovery had been effected. And when I take this event in another point of view, and reflect how much more

* “Prince Alfred.

miserable it would have been to have seen him lead a life of pain, and perhaps end thus at a more mature age, I also confess that the goodness of the Almighty appears strongly in what certainly gives me great concern, but might have been still more severe.

G. R."

"Windsor, May 6, 1783.

"MY GOOD LORD,

"The humanity which is not among the least conspicuous of your excellent qualities, would, I am persuaded, make you feel for the present distress in which the Queen and I are involved, had you not the farther incitement of a sincere attachment to us both.

"The little object we are deploring* was known to you, and consequently his merits; therefore you will not be surprised that the blow is strong. We both call on the sole assistant to those in distress—the dictates of religion. I have proposed to the Queen, and she approves of it, that I should desire you to come on Saturday, and bring Mr. Fisher with you, that, on Sunday, in my chapel in the Castle, we may have the comfort of hearing you preach, and receiving from your hands the Holy Communion. I think this a very proper time for renewing the baptismal vow; and, though greatly grieved, I feel true submission to the decrees of Providence, and great thankfulness for having enjoyed for four years that dear infant.

GEORGE R."

An interesting part of Lord Mahon's volume is the chapter on Life and Manners with which it concludes. His account is sometimes framed on rather a scanty induction, and his views are nowhere very penetrative or profound; but he has collected anecdotes which, taken with the usual allowance for humorous exaggeration and caution against hasty generalization, throw an instructive light upon the good old times. Having given the well-known stories of the remissness of Dr. Johnson's and Gibbon's tutors, he adds :

"The general contempt into which Oxford had fallen in the middle of the last century is further indicated by a lively touch of satire in Lord Chesterfield's Essays. The writer assumes it as quite impossible, that any person well acquainted with that University could desire it to become the place of education of his children. Speaking in the character of a country gentleman he says, 'When I took my son away from school, I resolved to send him directly abroad, having been at Oxford myself!'

"The remissness of the tutors at Oxford and at Cambridge led, of course, to other neglects of duty in those whom they had failed to teach. Such neglects were only too apparent in the Church of England of that age. Let us hear upon them a wholly unexceptionable witness—Dr. Thomas Newton, Bishop of Bristol, who died in 1782. In his Account of his own life this Prelate states, that by living and residing so much at Bristol he had hoped that his example would have induced the other members of the Church to perform their part also, and fulfil, at least, their Statutable duties. The Deanery, he states, was worth at least 500*l.* a year, and each Prebend about half that sum; and for these pre-

* "Prince Octavius, born 1779, died May 3, 1783.

ferments the residence then usually required was three months for the Dean and half that time for each Prebendary. ‘But alas!’ continues the worthy Prelate, ‘never was Chureh more shamefully neglected. The Bishop has several times been there for months together without seeing the face of Dean or Prebendary, or anything better than a Minor Canon.’ And as, in some cases, there were undisguised neglects of duty, so in others we may trace its jocular evasion. We may learn, on the same Episcopal authority, that the Church of Rochester was in no less ill plight than the Church of Bristol; and that on one of the Prebendaries dining with Bishop Pearce, the Bishop had asked him: ‘Pray, Dr. S., what is your time of residence at Rochester?’—‘My Lord,’ said he, ‘I reside there the better part of the year.’—‘I am very glad to hear it,’ replied the good Bishop. But the Doctor’s meaning and also the real fact was, that he resided at Rochester only during the week of the Audit!”—VII. 471—473.

The state of religion and learning among the Dissenters in this age, is disposed of in a very perfunctory way :

“We may observe with pleasure, that many as were the neglects and shortcomings of the Clergy in that age, their lives, at least, were pure. No charge of immorality can, with justice, be brought against them, unless in such few and rare cases as in any very numerous body must, of course, in time arise.

“The Dissenters of that age, or some of them, might have more zeal, but had even less of learning. In some cases we find their deficiencies acknowledged by themselves. Here is one entry from the Minutes of the Methodist Conference, in May, 1765. ‘Do not our people in general talk too much, and read too little? They do.’”—VII. 474.

We can hardly suppose that Lord Mahon has here fallen into the vulgar dialect of high life, which uses *Methodist* as a contemptuous synonyme for Dissenter; but the paragraph is as inaccurate as it is unjust. The Minutes of the Conference, he may be assured, had nothing to do with a deficiency of learning. The “too little reading” complained of was not a neglect of the classical authors or the Scriptures in the original tongue, but a preference of gossip to the perusal of the works of Wesley and Fletcher and the Arminian Magazine. It is very possible that Lord Mahon may never have heard of the names or seen the works of Taylor, Lardner and Benson; but in this state of ignorance he should not have ventured an opinion on the learning of the Dissenters. The Methodists of that age would have repudiated the imputation of Dissent, and the Presbyterians, Independents and Baptists, would have been much surprised at being lumped with the followers of Wesley and Whitfield, in an historian’s estimate of their literary attainments. We conclude our extracts with a passage descriptive of the state of the labouring population of England, which fully confirms all that has been said of the selfishness and indolence of the clergy :

“As a hundred years ago, the lands were too often untilled, so were the cultivators of the land too often untaught. Throughout England,

the education of the labouring classes was most grievously neglected, the supineness of the clergy of that age being manifest on this point as on every other. It would be very easy to adduce many cases of deplorable ignorance and consequent credulity at that period both in individuals and in whole villages or parishes. A few will suffice, however, to establish my conclusion.—A remarkable man, in after years the chief of a religious sect,—William Huntington,—describes himself as the son of poor parents in the Weald of Kent. Without any instruction during his first childhood, he found his vacant mind fill with silly fancies. ‘There was,’ says he, ‘in the village an exciseman, of a stern and hard-favoured countenance, whom I took notice of for having a stick covered with figures, and an ink-bottle hanging at his button-hole. This man I imagined to be employed by God Almighty to take an account of children’s sins!’ A person of far superior merit and attainments,—Hannah More,—declares that on first going to the village of Cheddar, near the cathedral city of Wells, ‘we found more than two hundred people in the parish, almost all very poor; no gentry; a dozen wealthy farmers, hard, brutal, and ignorant.... We saw but one Bible in all the parish, and that was used to prop a flower-pot!’

“Traces of ancient superstition were sometimes found to linger in the congenial darkness. Thus, in Northamptonshire, ‘Miss C. and her cousin, walking, saw a fire in a field, and a crowd around it. They said, ‘What is the matter?—Killing a calf.—What for?—To stop the murrain.’ They went away as quickly as possible. On speaking to the clergyman, he made inquiries. The people did not like to talk of the affair, but it appeared that when there is a disease among the cows, or when the calves are born sickly, they sacrifice, that is, kill and burn, one for good luck.’

“Pass we next to Suffolk. There, in the village of Wattisham, and in the year 1762, it chanced that six children of one family died in quick succession of a sudden and mysterious illness,—their feet having first mortified and dropped off. Professor Henslow, who resides at no great distance from Wattisham, has given much attention to the records of their case, and has made it clear in his excellent *Essay on the Diseases of Wheat*, that in all probability their death was owing to their imprudent use of deleterious food—the ergot of rye. But he adds, that in the neighbourhood, the popular belief was firm, that these poor children had been the victims of sorcery and witchcraft.”—VII. 491—493.

K.

A NOBLEMAN’S IDEA OF COMMERCE.

TRADE opens a passage to the discovery of other countries, and of the works of God and man, of nature and of art. It is the great incentive and the great instrument of society: it makes of mankind one body, and by mutual intercourse serves the occasions, supplies the wants, and ministers to the delight and entertainment one of another. It is the great interest of the kingdom: it inures men to hardship and danger, and instructs them in all the honest arts of living and self-security. It adds much to the power and strength of a nation, to the riches and revenue of the prince.—*George, Earl of Berkeley.* (1670.)

BIBLICAL SCIENCE.*

THE utility of exact study in subjects admitting only moral evidence, has latterly been established on the broadest and deepest basis of fact. We could point to several departments of human knowledge in which the introduction of scientific methods of investigation has led to the most satisfactory results. We could shew what uncertainties hung around those departments before a scientific spirit presided over their cultivation, and we could present the clear principles and unquestionable truths which the exercise of that spirit has brought to light. And in two ways could we offer this our demonstration of the importance of biblical science: we could offer it in studies which have only an indirect bearing on the Bible, and we could offer it in studies the express object of which is the illustration of the Bible.

Let us, for an example, take ethnology, or the science of nations, considered in regard to their origin and dispersion. As a science, this study is of recent date, though materials toward its cultivation date back to the days of Alexander and Herodotus. Not, however, before the surface of the earth had been traversed and explored, could its inhabitants be formed into groups by the hand of science, and referred to the stocks whence they had severally sprung and the seats which they originally occupied. While, in consequence, ethnology could not set the first step upwards to the dignity of a science, until the compass had come into use in the Western world, it was compelled for its full elevation to wait, not only for the discoveries made in the New World by the Spanish and Portuguese, but also for the conquests of Britain in the farther East, her explorations in the Arctic regions, and the peaceful results of her triumphant career in every ocean and on every shore all over the globe. Possessed of only bits and crumbs of knowledge, what could ethnology achieve? Besides, there are eyes that see not, or see dimly, or see wrong. Our earliest observers had not learnt the art of seeing. What they saw, they saw through the colourings of their own preconceptions. Only after many trials and by slow degrees did observers learn to see things as they were, and to make a true report of what they saw. Accordingly, of all beginnings, the beginnings of ethnology are fullest of absurdities. So ridiculous and so obviously fabulous are very many of the stories told by our travellers of three or four centuries ago, that one has difficulty to think that they themselves believed what they gravely record and announce. Another source of error was their credulity, which made them prone to receive a tale in proportion to its intrinsic improbability. What they accepted without judgment, they too often reported without discrimination; so

that, being in this particular inferior to their ancient prototype, Herodotus, they made no distinction between what they saw themselves and what they heard from others. Nay, they sometimes borrowed from predecessors wondrous narratives, which they give as containing what had passed under their own eyes. Thus our own Sir John Mandeville, who in 1327 quitted England for a tour in the East, had no scruple to minister from any quarter, and almost in any way, to the love of the marvellous which then occupied every breast. His monsters he takes from Pliny; the monkish legends supply him with his miracles. In his narratives, you have islands inhabited by giants fifty feet in height; demons who, from the summits of precipices, vomit torrents of flames on poor voyagers; men with their only eye in the middle of their forehead; and others one foot of whom serves for a parasol, such is its breadth and so easy is it of elevation.

With the progress of discovery, and the consequent progress of a knowledge of the earth, these fables fell into disrepute. But the substitution of facts for legends brought difficulties of no ordinary kind. The Bible, then accounted a repository of universal science, taught that there was but one race of men. Yet discovery had made known nations and tribes so dissimilar in position, in form, in colour and in usages, as to suggest the idea of aboriginal varieties, if not different species. How could the Hottentot and Bosgesman, the Red Indian, the Samoëide and the Caucasian, have descended from one pair? Nay, so near the brute creation did some wretched tribes stand, as to make it probable that man was only an improved form of the monkey. The sceptical view went so far as to maintain that every variety of men was autochthonous—the offspring, that is, of the spot where they were found. Hence, while the human being came into existence as the last step in a series of developments which had its lowest extreme in some zoophytic race, the varieties thus produced were endless, and could scarcely be said to have any definite and tangible points of union; so that it was more correct to speak of the diversity of the kinds, than of the unity of the species.

We have not space here to detail the various crudities and absurdities which obtained prevalence even among persons who made pretensions to superiority of intellect. A confused mass of heterogeneous and conflicting opinions, of groundless assumptions, of unsupported or partially-supported theories, occupied men's minds,—in some quarters passed for scientific determinations, and combined with the general spirit of the age to throw discredit on the Bible in general, and on the earlier chapters of the book of Genesis in particular. Now, had the infallibility of the biblical narrative been pleaded, and so far as that plea was put forward, the only possible result was a collision between the Scriptures and the age: the age would have been hardened in

the maintenance of its falsities—the Bible would have been injured in being committed to an unworthy conflict. Had the prosecution of ethnological study been pursued with a view to the justification of the biblical narratives and implication, Scripture would have been made to wait on science for a favourable audience, and, when that audience was gained, might have been charged with an attempt to qualify facts or even to bias the tribunal. But if the science of ethnology was cultivated on its own grounds, by its own professors, and for its own ends, then the results of such a course of study, if favourable to the biblical view of the origin of our race, would be so much pure gain to the cause of religion. The Bible would not have been lowered into a suitor ; science would not have been distorted or misrepresented ; but each of the two great powers, standing on their own grounds and working for their own objects, would bear an independent testimony to the same truths, give forth in common different but consentient utterances of the same Divine Mind, and combine to afford support to the one great cause of true religion. Such a result was exceedingly to be desired. Such is the actual result. But let it be distinctly remarked and carefully borne in mind, that this example of the harmony of religion and science we owe to the fact, that during the process religion and science kept each within its own sphere ; so that science was prosecuted apart from pre-judgments, and the oracle was simply asked to make its inspirations known. The determinations of ethnology are necessarily of recent occurrence. As man, viewed in regard to his lower nature, is a member of the animal kingdom, so might his origin and history be studied in the clearly ascertained doctrines of zoology, one of the latest of the sciences. Now it was ascertained that, with the inferior animals, the qualities of the species were transmitted by procreation. So long as individuals of the same species bred together, the line of transmission remained unbroken. But if procreation took place between individuals of different species, the line, though it might be continued for a link or two, soon came to a stop, and the offspring twice or thrice removed of a cross-breed were unfruitful. The animals, however, which for the sake of a name we may call human, propagate their kind, though never so diverse as to form, colour, origin, language or locality ; and the offspring of those intermarriages are as productive as their parents, if not more so. Indeed, cross-breeds,—for instance, the mulatto, the quadroon, &c.,—are known to possess a more vigorous life both in mind and body ; and not without reason may it be declared, that Providence, by the intermixture of races, which is now proceeding on so vast a scale, seems to aim at the elimination of inferior qualities, the propagation and increase of superior qualities, and the general elevation of human kind. However this may be, analogy with a clear and strong voice declares, that

since procreation is possible between any two races that wear the human form, all who wear the human form are of one species. Analogy shews another truth. In the animal world, new races are constantly formed, and these new combinations perpetuate themselves. Within the limits of species, these new races may be most various. The varieties may be produced under the influence or by the specific act of man. The varieties have also been and are still produced by the unconscious operations of physical nature in the variations of climate, food, and what we term accident. Look at the multitudinous variety of the canine species, and learn what changes may in the lapse of time be wrought by outer nature and the hand of man. Learn, too, at the same time, that amidst these variations the general type is never lost, but that the specific qualities of the race, as well as the specific differences of the several varieties, pass from age to age,—fixed and permanent under some circumstances, transmuted and multiplied under others. Call to mind, also, how diversified has been the lot of human beings; the surface of the earth how various;—the skies, now oppressive with heat, now intolerable for cold, now never dark, now dark for six entire months, now covered with cloud, now agitated with tempest;—human institutions, too, how dissimilar: the crushing despotism of the East, the peace and security of constitutional government, the constant alarms of African tyranny, and the benumbing efficacy of Egyptian superstition and Chinese conservatism. Facts of this description suffice to shew the possibility of the multiplication of one type into most dissimilar forms and varieties.

Then look at internal qualities. The unity of human nature is loudly proclaimed by the unity of our higher endowments. Intelligence, in its lowest manifestations, can never be mistaken for instinct, nor ever has instinct been known to rise into intelligence. Man's reasonable nature, including his emotions as well as his intellect,—his love towards his kind, as well as his homage toward his Maker,—marks him out as a being *sui generis*. This reasonable nature is shared by all who are ordinarily called men. The varieties are very great. At the one extremity we have the large discourse of a Newton, or the creative imagination of a Shakespeare; and at the other extremity, a narrowness and a dulness which, superficially regarded, scarcely seem superior to the qualities of the higher orders of the brutes. Nevertheless, there is a broad and clear line of distinction between man and the animal, so that you cannot confound the ouranoutang with human beings in the lowest condition possible.

It is true that unity of race, which now seems to be generally admitted as a fact, does not of necessity involve the derivation of all human beings from one pair. Yet is such a derivation the most simple cause; and being the most simple, is also the most probable. The tendency of the whole of modern science goes

to shew that God works the most multitudinous and complex results from the simplest means. When, then, a cause, sufficient in itself and simple in its nature, is assigned for any class of phenomena, analogy gives judgment in its behalf. Far more conformable to analogy is derivation from one pair of human beings, than the creation on different spots of several pairs, we know not how many.

Indeed, the unity of the source, as well as the unity of the race, is indicated by the general bearing of two other witnesses, both independent of each other, and of those to which reference has been already made; we mean history and language. Ethnology is the last voice of many combined sciences; and inasmuch as sciences, when fully developed and rightly interpreted, concur to attest the unity of our race, if not also the unity of our origin, as human beings, it surely is no unwarrantable conclusion that human beings are of one species and sprung from one pair. Now, what in this matter is the voice of universal history? All history, all tradition, all religions, superstitions, usages and opinions, combine to carry the thought back to Central or Western Asia, as the cradle of the human race. Not more certainly, not more constantly, does the needle point to the Pole, than does the finger of Providence, teaching mankind in its own history, point to some high and well-watered land in Southern or South-western Asia, as the birth-place of the human species.*

Language establishes the same fact. Already in the last century did that accomplished scholar, Sir William Jones, whose intimate acquaintance with languages gave him a peculiar right to be heard on the subject, pronounce it as his opinion that the inhabitants of Asia, and consequently of the whole earth, sprang from three branches of one stem, and that these three races of mankind differed from each other in language and other known characteristics. These three are the Arabic, the descendants of Shem; the Indian, of Ham; the Tartarian, of Japheth. In the dialects spoken by the various families of each of these, a connection and a resemblance may be traced.† That connection finds its explanation in a common origin in one pair of progenitors. The decision of our distinguished countryman has found illustration and support in the general tendency and result of continental scholarship. We do not pretend that philology has given its final judgment; nor do we mean to assert that all difficulties have been removed; but we are justified in reporting, as the general tendency and approximate result of recent philolo-

* As authorities, see Iselin, *Über die Geschichte der Menschheit*; Adelung, *Versuch einer Geschichte der Cultur des Menschlichen Geschlechts*; especially Herder, *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*. Heeren's *Historische Werke* are also of great value. Creuzer's works, as well as Ritter's *Erdkunde*, may be advantageously studied.

† See the *Asiatic Researches*, Vols. I. II. III.

gical investigations, the reduction of languages into a small number of classes, and the possession by those classes of common qualities which intimate unity of origin.

Before we supply on this interesting point a few illustrative particulars, it may not be useless if we present the unscientific view of the matter, as contained in these words:*

“ Il serait curieux de compter le nombre des différents langages qui se parlent aujourd’hui dans tout l’univers. Il y en a plus de trois mille dans ce que nous connaissons de notre continent. Chaque province Chinoise a son idiome ; le peuple de Pekin entend très-difficilement le peuple de Canton ; et l’Indien des côtes de Malabar n’entend point l’Indien de Bénarès.”

The writer, in opposition to the biblical account of the formation of languages, intends to represent the number of independent and disconnected languages in the world as very numerous. Doubtless existing languages are numerous, even more numerous than this masked assailant fancied. As certain it is now, that however numerous, they are for the most part intimately connected together, in such a manner as to point to a common origin. The amount of mental activity that has been brought to bear on this subject within the last half-century especially, has no measure, in the ordinary terms of our tongue. A new school of classical philology has been formed, the laws of which are of the most definite kind, and the productions of which are no less valuable than numerous. In the study of the Oriental languages, also, the utmost industry has been put forth, and results have ensued of the most gratifying kind. A mere enumeration of names and title-pages would be of no service, yet nothing more full could here even be thought of. In a word, the languages of the Old World have been subjected to the most minute scrutiny, the most comprehensive inspection, the most careful and exact comparison. What is the result ? Discoveries of the most astounding description have been made. The philosophers of Athens and the Druids of Anglesea spoke the same language. The sages of India who excited the admiration of Alexander, and the barbarians of Britain who before the eyes of Julius Cæsar navigated their native rivers in wicker cockles, were at the bottom of one tongue. In reality, the numerous languages of the Eastern continent have been reduced into the Shemitic, the Indo-Germanic, the Celtic, the Slavonic ; and these have been ascertained to possess points of resemblance so many and so decided, as to indicate a common origin.† With the languages of the aborigines of the Western continent, the matter is somewhat different. There

* See *La Bible enfin Expliquée*, par plusieurs Aumôniers de S. M. L. R. D. P. (sa Majesté le Roi de Prusse) ; Londres, 1777 ; Vol. I. pp. 38, 41.

† See Bopp’s *Comparative Grammar of the Sanscrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Luthuanian, Gothic, German and Slavonian Languages* ; translated from the German, 3 Vols, 8vo, 1845-51. Compare *Dieffenbach Cœlica*, I. and II., 1839-40, Stuttgart.

the diversities have been found to be both great and numerous: nor as yet have those diversities been found allied with such points of agreement as would justify the reduction of the tongues into a few comprehensive classes. But comparative philology is a young science, and the simplification which has ensued from the exact study of the languages of the Old continent, authorizes an expectation that a similar result will ensue from a similar cause in regard to the languages of the New continent.

Among the learned men who have rendered high services in this department of science, may be reckoned the Italian Balbi (born in 1782, died in 1848), the results of whose vast knowledge appeared in a concentrated form in his *Atlas Ethnographique du Globe*. In this monument of industry and science, 860 languages and about 5000 dialects appear in a state of classification. Of this prodigious number of idioms (in all, M. Balbi reckons 2000 languages as now in existence), 153 belong to Asia, 53 to Europe, 115 to Africa, 117 to the South Seas, and 422 to America. Accordingly, these several tongues are arranged, according to the localities where they are spoken, into these five classes: 1, Asiatic languages; 2, the European languages; 3, the African languages; 4, the Oceanic languages; and 5, the American languages. A similar division of languages is presented in a work, most carefully executed, and in its specimen alphabets and versions in the original types of extraordinary excellence and rare beauty, namely, "The Bible of every Land," the title of which stands at the head of this disquisition.

With the aid of these and other classifications, and with the aid of other considerations, ethnologists have thrown all the nations and tribes of the earth into groups. These groups vary in arrangement and in number—in part owing to the remaining uncertainties connected with the materials, in part owing to the point of view taken and the principles laid down by the several investigators. Buffon recognized but one human species. Linnaeus, recognizing also one species, divided that one species into five varieties. In the hands of Blumenbach, the five varieties sank to three. Virey maintained the existence of two species comprehending six races. Desmoulin raised the races to eleven, and Bory de Saint-Vincent made even fifteen species. One of the most recent and at the same time most learned of ethnologists, Klemm, in one of those comprehensive and exhaustive works of which only German scholarship is capable,* regards humanity as one individual found in different degrees of development and culture, and having accordingly the period of infancy, of childhood, of youth and of manhood. The different systems

* *Allgemeine Cultur-Geschichte der Menschheit*, von Gustav Klemm; Leipzig, 1843—1852. Consult Prichard's *Researches into the Physical History of Man* (1813), and his more recent works; also Colonel Hamilton's *Natural History of the Human Species*; Edinburgh, 1848.

of classification, while they give evidence of grounds of diversity, also make it clear that the approaches toward unity are such as to call for a systematic arrangement, and make such an arrangement both possible and desirable. Inclining as we do to the view put forth by Klemm, we may yet present the classification of Baron Cuvier, as that which is both simple and extensively, not to say generally, received. His view, which recognizes one species having three stocks and a great number of branches, may be presented thus:

<i>Caucasian Race</i>	Armenians	Assyrian Chaldean Arab Phenician Hebrew Abyssinian Egyptian?	
	Indians	Sanscrit branch Pelasic branch Gothic branch Selavonic branch Scythians and Tartars	Ancient Persian Hindoo Celts Greeks Latins Germans Dutch English Danes Swedes Russians Poles Bohemians Wends
<i>Mongolian or Altaic Race</i>	Siberians	Calmucks Calcas-Mongolians Mandchus Japanese and Coreans Siberians	Samocides Laplanders Esquimaux
<i>Negro or Ethiopic Race</i>	Caffres Fulahs Mandingos Fellatahs Hamburas Madagasscans Negroes of Middle Africa Hottentots Bosgesmans		

It has, however, been pleaded, that on the earliest Egyptian

monuments there appear marked distinctions of colour and form. The fact is unquestioned. What then? Already had there elapsed ages long enough and numerous enough to produce those varieties, especially during a condition of the earth when all its active powers were on a gigantic scale, and, being in fresh youthful vigour, acted with a subduing efficacy. And here we are brought to the point where Science and the Bible make the same report. The Bible deduces all varieties of human beings from one pair in the first place, and, in the second place, from three descendants of that one pair. This view presented by the Bible is substantially owned by Science; but the agreement extends to details. The triple paternity declared by the Bible has an historical recognition, for it is found on the Egyptian monuments.* Nay, both the Bible and the monuments recognize as existing very early the three chief varieties of colour in men. On the authority of Heeren† and Knoble,‡ as well as our own eyes, we may state that the Egyptians in their paintings present men of three complexions—white, red and black. The same three diversities they recognized in their gods; for they conceived of Osiris as black, Typhon as red, and Horus as white.§ The recognition of the Bible has the naming of Noah's sons for its date, and the fact remains the same whether they are considered as strictly three individuals, or representatives of three nations or stocks. Japheth seems properly to denote *beauty*, and therein fairness or white complexion. A fair skin was with the Hebrews, as it is with us, a sign of beauty: thus the hues of the lily and the rose are celebrated in their poetry as lovely (Cant. v. 10; Lam. iv. 7; compare Gen. vi. 2), as is also the case in the Arabian poets. On the contrary, black was a colour hateful to the Semitic Hebrews (Cant. i. 5; Lam. iv. 8), who, like other nations and individuals, in general preferred a complexion fairer than their own. The Japhetic Caucasian is still an object of idolatry for the fairness of her skin among the darker dyes of Europe as well as Asia.

While Japheth and the Japhetidae are the originals and the types of the whiter races, Ham and his descendants represent the darker, standing at the other extreme of colour. Ham—in Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriac—signifies *to be hot*, and as a consequence of the action of heat, to be *burnt* and to be *black*. The root found in the old Egyptian tongue, and in its modern representative, the Coptic, has in those languages the same import. Hence Egypt, among its natives, as well as among the Hebrews, was called Chami, “the land of Ham” (Ps. cv. 23; cvi. 22).

* See Osburn's *Ancient Egypt; her Testimony to the Bible*; London, 1846, pp. 23, 24.

† *Ideen*, II. 2, 88.

‡ *Die Völkertafel der Genesis*, pp. 3, 12.

§ *Plutarch de Isid.*, 22.

Here, then, we find the dark colour of our species, and we find also heat assigned as its special cause.

For evidence of the third diversity, we must appeal to circumstances, since the word Shem does not denote a colour, but rather a name. Indeed, on a little reflection, we see that the designation of the Shemites was not likely to be taken from the hue of their skin. The Hebrews were Shemites, and among the Hebrews originated our Scriptures. A nation, in speaking of itself, does not find a characteristic, still less its name, in its colour. Its own seems to it the natural colour; and it is led, by the strangeness of a different colour, when seen in others, to distinguish them by the discriminating epithets of white or black. But national vanity, or a better and higher feeling, national consciousness, may originate the distinctive epithet of "famous" or "men of name," that is, Shemites. In this way is the word Shem employed in the Hebrew. Thus, what in our version stands as "men of renown" (Gen. vi. 4; comp. xi. 4), is in the original "men of name," *Shem*. Such a designation is appropriate; for the Shemitic race, as in the Assyrians, gained the earliest fame of civilization. The Shemitic Hyksos conquered and for ages governed Egypt; and to the descendants of Shem the world owes its highest culture, as well as the cause of that culture, namely, the Bible and Revealed Religion.

But while the idea of colour is absent from the appellation Shem, it is found in connection with the descendants of that patriarch. The *Red* Sea seems to have been so called from the colour of its primitive inhabitants. The name of the Himirites, a tribe of Arabs who lived in Southern Arabia, and the name of the Edomites, who dwelt in Arabia Petraea, signify *red*, in allusion to the colour of the skin. Similar is the meaning of the name Phœnicians. According to the Talmud, the Jews were neither white nor black, but of a medium hue. These indications (others might be adduced) combine to shew that, as with the modern Arabs, the Shemites were, and were designated as, red, ruddy; that is, of a lighter or deeper brown complexion. Here, then, we have Egypt and the Bible in exact agreement. Nor is the accord of less value because it lies not on the surface, but has to be made out from a number of particulars. An agreement of the kind could not have been fabricated; it lies in the essence of things, and the deepest and most ancient imprints of language. Let it also be observed, that the agreement goes back to the very fountains of history. It is of far greater consequence than any synchronism between Egypt and the Bible. It is of far greater consequence than any correspondence in ordinary facts. Such synchronisms and correspondences do exist, forming a part of the multifarious testimony borne by science to the sacred Scriptures. Undoubtedly valuable, they scarcely bear comparison with an agreement which, lying at the very foundation of

our civilization and history, applies the severest test to the authenticity of the biblical narratives, inasmuch as the facts on which it is founded might have been contradicted, not only by Egypt, but also by ethnology in general. Instead, however, of being contradicted, this triple division of human kind finds corroboration in history, in language, and indeed in the general testimony of the past and the present. It is also a clear implication in the Bible, that the Hebrews were of a lighter complexion than the Egyptians. Hence was it that the latter admired Sarah when she accompanied her husband into their land—"the Egyptians beheld the woman that she was very fair" (Gen. xii. 14, 15). And Stephen, speaking evidently from the Egyptian point of view, states that Moses, even when an infant, "was exceeding fair" (Acts vii. 20),—a quality to which, according to Josephus (Antiq. ii. 9, 6, 7), the child was indebted for the attention he received from Pharaoh's daughter. In the lighter complexion of the Hebrews, may also be found the reason of the passion conceived for Joseph by his royal Egyptian mistress (Gen. xxxix. 7).

The implication, on the assumption of which we have just spoken, is grounded in fact. The Hebrews were of a complexion lighter than the Egyptians. On historical vouchers, we know that, while the former approached the lighter complexions, the latter approached the darker. The Greek tragic poet, Æschylus, ascribes to the Egyptians a dark hue. Lucian calls a young Egyptian "black complexioned," and Martial gives the epithet *fusca*, or *dark brown*, to the Egyptians living near the lake Mareotis and at Syene. By these and similar intimations it is not to be understood that the Egyptians were black and woolly-haired, after the Negro type. This is contradicted by the mummies, which, however, unite in shewing that the Egyptians were a dark-coloured race. Their modern representatives, the Copts, are also of a deep brown hue. In general, indeed, the Egyptians were, in physical as well as mental qualities, inferior to the Hebrews. Compare together the Egyptian type as seen on the monuments, and the Shemitic type as seen in Layard's excavations. Short of stature, the Egyptians had a broad undignified countenance, a thick skin, prominent cheek bones, the eyes wide apart, a rather broad and stumpy nose, and a large flat mouth,—all indications of an inferior race, as in the modern Copts. And in this inferiority is to be seen the proximate cause why the Hebrews, with their noble Shemitic blood, were able to maintain their foothold as a nation, and to develop under God's immediate supervision their pure religion, on a strip of somewhat ungrateful soil, by the very side of a people most advanced in all the branches and resources of an outer material culture. Here, again, Science and the Bible are found uttering the same voice; but never could the correspondence have been satisfactorily ascer-

tained, had not Science been cultivated purely for its own results, and had not the Bible been studied exclusively for its facts.

If now we, for a brief space, give attention to the races of Africa, including Egypt of course, we shall meet with fresh points of correspondence, and new reasons for respecting the biblical history. In general, the Bible, in its great and invaluable register of nations (Gen. x.),—a document which many have condemned because they were ignorant, and others have criticised in an adverse spirit, without having taken the trouble to acquire the requisite fund of knowledge,—describes Africa as the land of the Hamites. Of the native inhabitants of that quarter of the globe, the Bible gives three divisions—Cush, Mizraim and Phut. The first are the Ethiopians, who dwelt in the south; the second, the Egyptians, who in the north inhabited the valley of the Nile; and the third, the Libyans, who dwelt in the west, and whose Egyptian name is Phet, the very name given them on the authority of Moses. The Bible, in thus recognizing three indigenous races in Africa, corresponds with the general tenor of ancient history.

Omitting the Ethiopians and the Libyans, as opening too wide a subject, we will in a few words advert to the Egyptians. In Genesis (x. 6), Egypt is termed Mizraim. The word in the original is of the plural form. We might, though but imperfectly, give its force if we translated it by *Egypt*s. This plural form corresponds with fact. There was, in a certain sense, more than one Egypt. There was Lower Egypt and there was Upper Egypt. Nor was this a mere civil division. The ground of the plurality lay in the natural formation of the country, and the native conceptions which hence arose. Lower Egypt is, and of old was regarded and termed, “the gift of the Nile.” It is simply an agglomeration of the deposits of the Nile. As later in origin, Lower Egypt was later in civilization than Upper Egypt. Two *Egypt*s thus arose—the ancient, the modern; and the distinction became permanent, engraving itself in the opinions, the language and the usages of the country. For the facility of explanation, we have described Mizraim as a plural. More precisely described, it is in the dual form—the form, that is, which denotes specifically two. Thus, then, the word speaks of the *two Egypt*s, as we now use the phrase, “the two Sicilies;” but the term is of Shemitic origin. Accordingly the Bible, from its own point of view, describes Egypt as two. In so doing, it is in exact agreement with Egyptian archæology. From its depth and minuteness, the argument has special value.

But this is not all. The term exists in a singular form (2 Kings xix. 24; Is. xix. 6; Mic. vii. 12), and signifies an *enclosure*. To the Hebrews, then, Egypt appeared as an enclosure. An enclosure Egypt is, for it is a lengthened ravine: it is the Nile valley which is formed by two parallel ranges of mountains.

The great antiquity of the name, and, in consequence, the great antiquity of the people who gave the name, may be learnt from the fact that the Delta, or that which formed the greater part of Lower Egypt, could not have occasioned the designation, inasmuch as being flat and open, it would have been called “the flat” or “the open land;” as, indeed, the name Delta ($\tauὸ\Delta\lambdaτα$, the Δ or De-like land), in use as early as the days of Herodotus (Euterpe, x. 5), may be understood to mean. The Hebrew designation, however, taken from the peculiar formation of the upper country, must have come into existence before the lower was fully deposited and rendered habitable. The fact is the more striking because it was near the lower, not the upper, country that the Hebrews had their habitation. Clearly, in some very remote period, those who spoke the Hebrew language, having reached to a height of culture sufficient to lead them to an acquaintance with the geognostics of distant countries, gave to Egypt a name of their own tongue, which was correctly descriptive of its physical form; and afterwards, doubling the name by the use of their own dual, comprised the lower and more recent country in the original designation. These facts are as curious as the correspondences they involve are striking and satisfactory. Had we space to pursue the subject, we could readily add, not only confirmation to these statements and views, but shew in detail that the places in Egypt mentioned by the scriptural writers correspond as to locality, and as to general condition or character, with facts clearly and fully ascertained on Egyptian and other guarantees.

The philological discoveries which have within the last half century been made in connection with the ruins that cover the valley of the Nile, furnish a decisive test of the historical reliability of the place assigned to the Egyptians in the biblical register of nations. By the efforts of Adelung,* Champollion,† Bunsen‡ and Lepsius,§ the position of the ancient Egyptian tongue in the great family of languages has been definitively ascertained. The mother of the modern Coptic, the old Egyptian, which goes back to the earliest ages of Egyptian culture, stands at the head of the Hamitic languages. This is the general fact. Modern philology has, as we have seen, supplied grounds for the opinion that all existing languages may be traced up to three fountains, and that these fountains flowed from one common source. Having a common origin, each of the three great divisions must of course possess some common elements. These common elements, however, are inconsiderable in comparison

* *Mithridates* (Berlin, 1806-17).

† *L'Egypte sous les Pharaons* (Paris, 1811); *Grammaire Egyptienne* (1836).

‡ *Ægypten's Stelle in der Weltgeschichte* (Hamburg, 1845).

§ *Denkmäler aus Ægypten*, still in progress of publication. See also Kenrick's *Ancient Egypt under the Pharaohs* (London, 1850).

with the several distinctive peculiarities. So is it with the Hamitic languages, compared with the Shemitic and the Japhetic. In some common elements, the Egyptian tongue has a point of contact with the Shemitic, and through the Shemitic with the Aramaean,—the branch of the Shemitic to which belong the Arabic, and its sister tongues, the Hebrew and the Syriac. As, however, the old Egyptian stands in the Hamitic class, to the Hamitic race must the Egyptian people be referred. This is now a well-established ethnological fact. Here, then, is a scientific test which may be applied to the biblical history. Suppose that in the register of nations Egypt ranked with the Shemites or the Japhetites, then would there exist a contradiction between the Bible and modern Science. But suppose that Egypt occupies in the register a place among the Hamitic races, then the Bible and modern Science are at one on the point. Such is the biblical position of Egypt. Who can fail to be struck with this coincidence? Thousands of years after the materials of the register came into existence, and the register itself was composed, the learned inquiries of a few individuals put into our hands a touchstone. The criterion is applied, and we ascertain as a fact, as a proved and indisputable fact, that which in the Bible stands as a record. Could the biblical history endure such a test, were it not substantially true—were it not a real picture of the times of which it speaks—were it not a simple, genuine and therefore trustworthy statement of actual realities—were it not an authentic and faithful representation of what its authors saw, heard and knew? The register of nations was drawn up on two bases—on the basis of colour and the basis of speech. In the diversities of colour and speech, its author saw and acknowledged the dividing lines which marked and declared corresponding diversities of blood and origin. These are the two bases which our modern science recognizes, and on which, as on proper grounds, it has worked, producing thereby definite and satisfactory results. Here, then, again the Bible and Science are at one.

But while the Bible is thus proved to be in agreement with science and with fact, the Bible is the sole ancient work which possesses this high merit, and in this peculiarity very far transcends the most learned writers of ancient times, throwing even Plato into the shade. The reason is simple and obvious. The authors of the biblical records satisfied themselves with speaking of what they saw and knew; other ancient writers indulged in speculation, and allowed their speculations to colour, if not distort, their statements. It may serve to illustrate the wisdom and the value of the biblical narrative, if we here give the substance of an ethnological experiment, ascribed by Herodotus (ii. 2) to Psammeticus. That monarch, wishing to ascertain by a decisive proof what race of men were most ancient, took two newly-born infants, and put them into a dwelling,

whence all human beings were strictly shut out. With a view to their sustenance, a goat was admitted into the room every day. At the end of two years, a shepherd, at the king's request, paid the boys a visit. On entering, his ears were saluted by the word *Bekos*. A report of the result was carried to Psammeticus, who immediately set on foot an inquiry with a view to learn what *Bekos* meant, and by what people the word was used. On due research, it was discovered that *Bekos*, in the Phrygian language, signified bread. Maturely considering the import of the facts thus learnt, the Egyptians, who had aforetime claimed the distinction of being the oldest of nations, admitted that the Phrygians were more ancient than themselves. This is no idle popular story; for the Greek historian states that he received it from the lips of the priests of Vulcan at Memphis.

It will now be seen with what propriety and with what consistency the author of Genesis makes an interpreter intervene ("an interpreter was between them," is the Hebrew rendered word for word, Gen. xlvi. 23) between Joseph, who acted the part of an Egyptian, and his guilty brethren. The inhabitants of the highlands of Palestine and the inhabitants of the valley of the Nile spoke different languages: the two languages were more dissimilar than the English and the French. Those who used the one, could not understand the other. An interpreter was of absolute necessity. Here, again, is an historical implication which on inquiry is found to be rigorously accordant with fact. A similar implication may be seen in Isaiah xix. 8.

Were we to pursue this train of investigation, and compare the now known parentage of other ancient tongues, and the origin of other ancient peoples, with the position they hold in the narratives of Holy Scripture, we should be able to present similar tokens of historical verity in great abundance; and consequently we find ourselves justified in the general conclusion, not only that in historical worth the Bible surpasses all other ancient writings, but supplies historical information partly in a direct, partly in an indirect, form, which merits full and unqualified reliance. On a conclusion so broad and so solid, we should be warranted in establishing it as a general rule, that exceptional cases, should any exceptional cases offer themselves, are only in appearance exceptional cases, and that difficulties will disappear in the degree in which sustained industry and sound knowledge lead to a right and full understanding of the Bible, and to solid and permanent scientific conclusions.

We have, we submit, sufficiently proved that religion has nothing to fear from science; but that, on the contrary, exact study of all kinds, leading as it does to knowledge, makes important contributions toward illustrating the import and exhibiting the reliability of the sacred writings. For our purpose, we have taken only one science, ethnology. We have given the preference

to this science on two grounds,—first, the Bible professes to supply distinct and comparatively full information as to the origin of nations; and secondly, ethnology is among the youngest of the sciences, and most naturally, therefore, falls within the review we are making of biblical science as developed during the present century. That during that period that science has been greatly promoted by the advances made in other sciences, must now be clear to the reader. A much larger and, in some instances, more striking mass of illustration having the same tendency would arise, were other branches of knowledge brought to bestow their fruit; for ample is the amount which general history, archæology and geography have at their disposal.

Our object, however, has not been the defence of the Bible, but rather the enforcement of severer methods of studying its history and contents. With that view, we have endeavoured to prove that biblical science should be prosecuted as science of every other kind—solely for its own sake and the sake of truth, without predilection, without assumptions, without foregone conclusions, and with an all-absorbing desire and a most earnest quest after truth; in the assurance that, as truth is of God, so should truth be loved by all good and wise men; and so must truth prove, sooner or later, less or more obviously, in smaller or greater measures, conducive to the interests of religion and the general good of human kind.

Let us, however, guard what we have said against mistake. By no means do we place the credibility or religious acceptance of the Bible on the issue of its agreeing with the conclusions of modern science. When rightly understood, the Bible neither needs nor accepts confirmation from human knowledge, standing securely as it does on its own internal and unfailing worth. Yet, when the Bible is assailed on the ground of its alleged divergency from Science, its friends may be permitted to shew that the allegation, when put forward in its generality, is untrue; and they may also be pardoned if, while they welcome any proved identity of statement on the part of Science and the Bible, they “rejoice, yea, and will rejoice,” when the two great witnesses for God, the Bible and the Universe, speak in substance the same things. Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that the Bible is independent of all science; nay, did not its science reflect the science of the several ages through which it passed during the long period of its birth, it would have lacked one of the chief tokens and proofs of its authenticity, as well as one of the highest claims on our acceptance and our respect. The Bible, as the product of very many centuries, appears on its human side in the chequered and ever-varying lights and shades of the history of a whole nation, and in part of the history of the world. At the same time a light, a pure light, an ever-glowing light from heaven, “above the brightness of the sun,” throws its

brilliancy over those human events, and controls and sanctifies those human opinions. That religious light constitutes the permanent truth and the indestructible worth of the Bible. The Bible was given to lead men to God. That high work the Bible has never from the first ceased to perform. That high work it will continue to perform for all who repair to it as the ever fresh and living fountain of religious truth.

J. R. B.

THE MINISTERIAL PROFESSION.

THE publication of which we give the title below,* is, we believe, *unique*. It is the apology of an earnest and richly-stored mind, in the fulness and maturity of its powers, for retiring, temporarily at least, from the office of a Christian preacher. It is not that the author has ceased to take an interest in his profession, or been led to think lightly of its capabilities: so far otherwise, that it is on his high estimate and deep love of the office that he founds his apology. Nor is it that he has been unsuccessful or unappreciated in his labours: so far otherwise, that his congregation, during the year and a half since he announced to them his purpose, have made repeated but vain efforts to induce him to relent; and now, despairing of finding his like in this exhausted old Europe, to speak to them with fitting power the word of life, they have asked the question deprecated by Moses, “Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it?” and have sought for a successor in the young country and auspicious name of Channing.

There is much in Mr. Thom’s Farewell Sermon which is most beautifully and affectingly said, and which it must have been still more deeply touching to hear; and were it a mere farewell between himself and his people, we should hesitate to make it a subject for comment. As, however, it has been published avowedly for the purpose of calling attention to truths of general interest, we feel it to be not only admissible, but imperative, that we should examine its positions. The publication, indeed, almost seems to call upon the members of the ministerial profession as a body to put forth some justification for continuing their labours; since, if Mr. Thom’s reasoning be sound, others ought to follow his example and make a general *turn-out*. He deprecates this inference, it is true, saying, “I lay down no rule for stronger or more faithful men;” but it would be presumptuous affectation indeed for the mass of the profession to retain their offices on the score of possessing either greater powers or

* A Farewell Sermon, preached in Renshaw-Street Chapel, Liverpool, on Sunday, June 25, 1854, by John Hamilton Thom. London—John Chapman.

greater faithfulness than the gifted and earnest author of the sermon before us.

The main consideration by which Mr. Thom justifies his retirement is, that he is afraid of losing all freshness for his work, and of falling into a life of mere routine; and he lays great stress on the undue amount of *expression* periodically looked for from the professed ministers of Christ. But let us give his own words:

“Speech is too largely the instrument of the Minister of Religion. The demand for the *expression* of religious thoughts and feelings is incessant. A man’s life ceases to be one of free action, and becomes one of official services. There is not one moment in which the cloud of this impending necessity does not hang fearfully over the heart of a conscientious man, darkening as the hour approaches. But Expression is a sacred thing; its power is in its truth; it comes free only out of deep and rich experiences; it is forced at the peril of a man’s soul; it is wrung out of him only at the price of the spoiling of his nature. Perhaps the rarest gift that God confers upon a man is the power of interesting, quickening, or elevating other men by the utterance of his thoughts, especially upon subjects spiritual and eternal, when they touch no living passion. Yet here is a Profession built upon this power, presuming upon the possession of it as if it was the common faculty of ordinary men. It is only thoughtlessness, or deep ignorance of human nature, or the levity that delights to contrast the promise of a sacred profession with its poor performance, that could express surprise or scorn at the result. When the world complains of the failure and the feebleness of Preaching, little does it know what it has exacted: and, for my own part, my feeling is only one of increasing wonder that it is so genuine and so powerful as it is. In all other cases where Speech is the Instrument that works great effects, great interests are felt to be at stake, matters on which men are livingly moved. The speaker has not to give a form and body to the invisible substance of impalpable Thought. Where business, where passion, where justice or oppression, where human Life and Happiness are involved,—the speaker has already upon his side the might of Realities, I mean of Realities that are *seen* to be such, and to those concerned his coldest words touch nerves that thrill. The Preacher indeed has great interests, but not therefore matters on which men are already greatly interested, and seldom or never the passionate urgency of a real occasion. It cannot be supposed that it is natural to any man to desire to speak twice weekly at great length, and for the instruction of other men, upon themes that exhaust a man’s nature to approach even in contemplation, God, and Eternity, and Human Aspiration and Duty, and the Bridge of Death. It is not *to think* of these things that is unnatural or an effort, but to think of them with the view of one’s thoughts passing into words, that they may raise to spring-tides the living waters that lie latent in the cells of other men’s souls. It is this, to have to think and feel *with a view to others*, that so often stops Thought itself, breaks its living flow, and curdles and taints Emotion by the reflection of how it is to be used. The desire for the utterance of a man’s spirit in any deep directions is intermittent, and even to the richest nature, and most sympathizing heart, can only be

occasional; whereas the Profession of a Minister of Religion, as it is exercised amongst us, assumes that the desire is perennial, and the faculty always ready. It is strange to think that all the words that Christ ever spoke, the words that ever since have fed the world, and can never be exhausted because they came out of the heart of his Life, would not reach in length to two or three of our Sermons. The whole of the New Testament would not serve the exigencies of a modern Preacher for six weeks. There must be something wrong in this. No Profession can safely be built upon the supposition that such a Power can be natural or possible to ordinary men, and only ordinary men can be looked for as the mass of any Profession. And so they become wearisome expositors instead of living springs,—framers of sentences instead of mighty Energies of God. Men of rare faculty can meet these demands out of their exuberant fulness, without having to press upon the springs of their nature till they break: men of a saintly heart, still rarer than the richest faculty, can meet them out of the sufficiency of Love: men of merely systematic minds, and classified emotions, can meet them with their fixed Methods and their shaped Formularies, which as they think contain all religious Truth and Healing, and have only to be *applied* to the various cases of human need: men of a low standard will live content with the perfunctory discharge of any Duties whatever, and waste themselves with no sighs of impotent desire—but those who cannot speak except out of a living impulse, and who will not speak beyond the reality of present feeling, to whom yet God has not given the vision and the faculty that are ever ready, with whom their deepest feelings collect but slowly in their hearts, and have to be mused over long before the fire breaks forth—whose tears lie not too near their eyes, nor their words too near their lips,—are compelled often to be silent altogether, or else with shame, and mistrust, and a sense of failure, itself enfeebling and humiliating, to have recourse to something that did once come from a living spring.”*

No minister can read this without profound and intense sympathy; but we feel impelled to inquire if the feeling so touchingly and vividly depicted, be altogether healthy and legitimate. The maxim is as old as Horace at least, that every man is prone to magnify the evils incident to his own calling, and to envy those who occupy a different position. The man of business or the lawyer, amidst the dry and dusty drudgery of his stated occupation, may perhaps at times cast longing glances at those (such as the ~~artist~~, the author, or the minister of religion) whose specific work lies in the region of their most fondly-cherished tastes and deepest feelings; while they, in their turn, are apt to wish themselves in the places of those whose stated occupation does not demand the regular exercise of capricious and uncertain faculties, but who gain a position of ease and comfort, perhaps even of affluence and distinction, by the steady exertion of powers on which they can always rely, and who are free, in their fondly-prized and intensely-enjoyed intervals of leisure, to exercise their

tastes and indulge their feelings according to the dictates of their own sweet will. By an unfortunate perversity of our nature, the effort in which a man delights when it is spontaneous (especially if it be also forbidden, "stolen waters" being proverbially "sweet"), is apt to become intolerably irksome when hardened into a professional duty. The fountain of living energy within him which gushed forth pure and plenteous when free, sometimes refuses to flow when conscious of constraint.

The minister of religion is exposed to further and peculiar peril, arising from the fact that the exercise of his calling presumes the unchanged continuance of earnest *faith* in unseen and undemonstrable conceptions of the human soul, which, by the development of his powers of thought, or under the influence of life's heated atmosphere, may become hazy and indistinct, or vanish into invisible air. This is a danger, it is true, to which the comparative freedom of Unitarian churches renders their ministers as little liable as ministers of religion can be, and we may dismiss it from our consideration at present, the more especially as, in the case before us, there has not been a diminished, but rather an increased, earnestness of faith in spiritual realities. To those, however, who contemplate devoting themselves to the work of the ministry, with its poor and precarious possibilities of worldly good, at a time when able and eloquent thinkers are successively denying or undermining every foundation on which any religious faith can rest, we would, in passing, address a friendly warning to consider well what they do before they stake their chance of happiness or usefulness in life on the continuance of a speculative faith, that may not be able to endure the shocks to which it will be exposed. To those, indeed, who have a matured faith and a holy courage, assuring them that they can overcome in the conflict with indifference and scepticism, in the world and in their own hearts, the Christian ministry presents a noble and abundant field of labour, usefulness, happiness and even distinction; but to those who are not so assured, and yet think of entering that perilous calling, we would address, in all seriousness, Punch's advice to those intending to marry—*Don't*. Do not identify yourselves with the profession of a faith which may lose by degrees all vitality in your hearts, until you awake with a start to find yourselves chained to a dead form; but rather gain your bread by some honest and healthful occupation, which will permit you, in your leisure hours, either to speculate to the top of your bent, if so disposed, with free, light, untroubled heart, careless as to the result, or to cast all misty speculations aside, and to spend your spare time in the safe and pleasant fields of nature, science, history, poetry and art, cheered by the domestic and social relations of a blessed earthly home.

Supposing, however, that a minister's religious faith is matured in his soul as a safe and predominant principle, we would

ask, Is not that proneness of our nature, to tire of our appointed work, a morbid perversity, to be checked and struggled against, rather than a genuine and legitimate desire? It surely ought to be the happiest and most desirable position for a man to be engaged in work that approves itself to his natural tastes and feelings. How justly eloquent is Mr. Ruskin against all mere drudgery! How well does he illustrate the enormous evil attendant on the devotion of a man's whole time to work that does not give scope for his best and highest powers! Assuming, then, a minister's heart to be in his work, we should naturally infer that, so far from tiring in the exercise of his profession, it would become more and more interesting to him; and that, so far from exhausting its resources, he would find them to grow into unanticipated and ever-increasing richness. This is surely the case with every other intellectual profession to which a man is really devoted. The literary student, the philosopher, the artist, the poet, if true to the spirit of his calling, does not find that the materials of his work are used up, but, on the contrary, that they multiply around him far more than in proportion to his diligence in using them; and never, probably, is he so full of new ideas as at the moment when death or physical decline interrupts the exertion of his mental powers. And might not the same thing be said, in many cases at least, of the profession of a religious preacher? Is it not the newly-fledged minister, just emerging from his collegiate nest, who is most apt to fancy that he has exhausted the whole realm of moral and spiritual truth—that he has no more worlds to conquer, no more truths to utter? Is it not, on the other hand, the experienced preacher who is most deeply impressed with the spiritual needs and practical shortcomings of mankind, and feels most full of matter on which it is appropriate and useful to enlarge? We believe it would be easy to point to many instances in illustration on both sides of the Atlantic, and we ourselves have one instance in recent and tender remembrance, of a minister who addressed the same congregation for more than forty years, and whose services were characterized to the very last by undiminished, nay, even increasing, freshness and poetry of religious sentiment. He was seldom indeed without something which he felt that it was appropriate and good to say to his hearers, and their hearts seldom, if ever, failed to respond to his appeals. Yet he was not distinguished by those rare gifts of genius or saintly enthusiasm which Mr. Thom allows to constitute exceptional cases. He simply looked upon the face of Nature and the ways of Providence, interpreted by the suggestive lessons of Holy Scripture, with cheerful, trustful hope, and uttered a word in season with the clear, vigorous and chastened eloquence of a devout and earnest heart, aided by a well-stored mind, a rich imagination and a cultivated taste.

But it is time to inquire, What is the proper aim and office

of a sermon? Certainly, if every sermon affects to be a prophecy or a revelation, as Mr. Thom's arguments and illustrations seem to presume, it can be bound by no rule, and to look for it as a matter of course once a-week, or once a-year, would be absurd. But when we are told that all the words that Jesus uttered would be exhausted in three sermons, and that the whole of the New Testament would not last a modern preacher six weeks, are we to understand that the New Testament contains all that Jesus and his apostles *did* utter? During the undetermined period of the ministry of Jesus, when he was always going about through the cities and villages of Galilee and Judæa, teaching in the synagogues and in the temple, and preaching the gospel (as we so frequently find it recorded), are we to suppose that he uttered no more words than those which happen to have been recorded and handed down to us? If he did, then his power of *expression* was not so soon exhausted as the illustration implies. If he did not, but used the same simple words over and over again, then we have at least a high authority and sanction for that *repetition* from which Mr. Thom seems so sensitively to shrink, when he speaks of being compelled to fall back upon what "did once come from a living spring." With regard to the apostles, how significant are the brief statements that Paul went into the synagogue at Corinth and "spake boldly for the space of *three months*, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God;" and again, that he disputed "*daily* in the school of one Tyrannus; and this continued by the space of *two years*;" followed by his own recorded declaration to the elders of the Ephesian church, "By the space of *three years*, I ceased not to warn every one *night and day* with tears;" and that most comfortable incident for modern preachers, when Paul was so "*long preaching*," that "*a certain young man named Eutychus, being fallen into a deep sleep*," "*sunk down with sleep, and fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead*!"* So far was the apostle from feeling exhausted, or at a loss for matter, that he felt under the pressure of a constant impulse in his soul to declare the testimony of God, leading him to exclaim, "Though I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of; for necessity is laid upon me; yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel!"† All these fragmentary hints shew, either that there must have been a considerable demand on Paul's powers of *expression*, or that he repeated himself over and over again.

One word with regard to repetition. Do not men require a recurrence of the same spiritual food, with nearly as uniform a regularity as their bodies require a recurrence of the same material sustenance? Are there not some truths of which it is good for all men to be reminded from time to time, even though they

* *Acts xix. xx.*

† *1 Cor. ix. 16.*

have heard them from time to time before? Is it not rational now for preachers to adopt the principle laid down by an apostle, “I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things, *though ye know them*, and be established in the present truth: yea, I think it meet, so long as I am in this tabernacle, to *stir you up* by putting you in remembrance”?*

Here we may say that we know not how to reconcile the rigid requirement of novelty in the sermon, with the frequently expressed desire of uniformity in the devotional part of the service, and, moreover, with the outcry that has been raised in some quarters against a sermon at all as an essential part of public worship. On the one hand, if every *sermon* must be a special inspiration of the moment, why not every *prayer* and every *hymn*? On the other hand, if men like to assemble for worship to hear the same prayers, the same hymns, the same lessons of Scripture repeated from time to time, why can they not endure an occasional repetition of the same wholesome truths?

We have been accustomed to deem it a great point of superiority in the forms of Protestant worship, that so much is addressed to the understanding,—that men sing, pray and are addressed “with the spirit” and “with the understanding also.” But if so much *expression* is to be deprecated as worse than useless, then we had better adopt the childish mummeries of Romanism or Paganism, counting our prayers by beads, like the worshippers of the Virgin, or by so many turns of a wheel, like the Hindoos; or sit in silence, waiting for inspiration, like the Quakers. This last appears to us the only ultimate alternative, if systematic and periodical expression by a professional class be set aside. This alternative, however, seems to us open to the objection, that those most ready to fancy themselves inspired, might not be those who could be listened to with most profit, but rather the vain and superficial. The most really superior men would perhaps feel the greatest hesitation in assuming, by a spontaneous and arbitrary effort, the attitude of spiritual teachers. Again, if, as some have lately recommended, a form of *worship* were agreed upon, and the sermon left to be an optional matter with both minister and hearers, so that, on the one hand, he would not need to speak unless he felt “the passionate urgency of a real occasion,” and, on the other hand, those who came to pray might be at liberty to depart when the prayers were over, if they pleased,—how formidable would the effort at once become to a modest and sensitive man, thus virtually to declare that he had something of special importance to say, something equivalent to a revelation to communicate! He would no longer stand in the comparatively unassuming position of a fellow-worshipper who had made it his business to meditate upon spiritual things and to

* 2 Peter i. 12, 13.

give his hearers the result, but in the awful attitude of one claiming to be inspired with a prophet's burning words. Surely the very assumption thus virtually put forth, would often silence a man who might otherwise have spoken wholesome words of needed comfort or seasonable admonition. And let it be remembered that there are here two opposite possibilities. It is true that a man may, on the one hand, have an overweening conceit, and imagine himself to be speaking important truth when he is only beating the air; but, on the other hand, he may be imparting to some amongst his hearers inexpressible comfort or invaluable guidance, when in his own humble estimation his efforts are a total failure. If a preacher be liable to be blind to the weakness of the pulpit, he may equally be unconscious of its power. "The foolishness of preaching" may secretly be "the power of God unto salvation" to some by whom it is "spiritually discerned."

Nor let it be forgotten that all our faculties, and most of all our highest and best, need diligent and constant cultivation and exercise to reach their proper development and to preserve their activity and strength. The necessity of exertion has stimulated many mighty and brilliant efforts of genius, which otherwise would never have been put forth; and the spiritual faculty is no exception to the general rule. We must "watch and pray," if we would be superior to the temptations of indolence and love of ease, and acquire strength of spirit so as to overcome the weakness of the flesh. Ministers of the present day will do well to apply to themselves the exhortations of Paul to his youthful fellow-labourer, Timothy—"Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to instruction. Neglect not the gracious gift that is in thee." "Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy improvement may be manifest in all things. Take heed unto thyself and unto instruction; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee."* "I put thee in remembrance that thou stir up the gracious gift of God which is in thee."† "Watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry."‡

Mr. Thom informs us, in his published sermon, that it has been a settled purpose with him to quit the work of preaching, as he has now done, from his entrance upon the profession when a very young man. We can understand the purpose being then formed. To a very young man, the *prospect* of preaching successively, Sunday after Sunday, to the same hearers for years, is more formidable than the reality commonly proves to be. We remember in our own early youth deriving a comfortable hint from a very unpretending source, in Miss Emily Taylor's admi-

* 1 Tim. iv. 13—16.

† 2 Tim. i. 6.

‡ 2 Tim. iv. 5.

rable and humorous fable of the Discontented Pendulum, which stopped the clock because it was *tired of ticking*, but was at length *staggered* by the consideration that, though it could *think* of millions of ticks at once, it would never be required to *execute* more than one, and that a separate second would always be allotted for the performance of every separate tick. “Sufficient unto the day is the *trouble* thereof.” “As thy day is, so shall thy strength be.” “Who gives the burden, gives the strength to bear.” With the most respectful and sympathizing tenderness for the peculiar difficulties felt by a man of sensitive and fastidious (may we say morbid?) feelings, we must be allowed to express our conviction that a minister fairly endowed by nature and education, if only he lose not the one thing needful,—if only his *faith* fail not,—if he continue to have a deep and holy interest in the work of the ministry, as a truly important and sacred calling, full of opportunities of doing good to the souls of men,—will seldom feel at a loss for thoughts and words which he deems it good and seasonable to utter to his hearers; more especially if they comprise all sorts and conditions of men, including not merely the prosperous and luxurious children of this world who “have no need of repentance,” but those also who do hard battle with the stern realities of life, and come to the house of God thirsting for the living water of simple and immortal truth. If the editor of a periodical, of a weekly and even daily newspaper, can find matter wherewith to interest worldly readers, it ought not to be felt as an unreasonable burden on a man of matured mind and devout heart, to speak once a-week a few words of spiritual wisdom as an appropriate lesson of the day. If it be not in his heart to say much, let him not affect to have much to say, but let a few brief and simple words of seasonable truth suffice; or let him adopt Sir Roger de Coverley’s sensible plan, to which, in such a case, we can see no shadow of a reasonable objection,—let him draw from the treasured wealth of the departed fathers in our churches, who have left behind them imperishable memorials of their holy eloquence to instruct and enrich posterity. Rich though our literature is in such accumulated stores, the members of our congregations are not usually so much addicted to the study even of the finest models of pulpit eloquence, as to make it difficult to present them with what is both excellent and new.

We fully concur with the following passage :

“I believe that all rich speech is the fruit of a rich life: I believe that without this the tongues of men, or of angels, are in imminent danger of becoming sounding brass and tinkling cymbals: I believe that the more a man has to speak on spiritual things, the more he ought to live not in thoughts and self-raised emotions but in works, and sacrifices, and communion of spirit with all his fellows, if he would not make himself hollow and a lie.”*

But we cannot see that a minister's time needs, any more than that it ought, to be wholly or mainly taken up in preparation for pulpit expression, to the exclusion of practical work. We believe that the more truly a minister throws himself amongst his people as a pastor and fellow-labourer in useful undertakings, the more richly and regularly will his heart be filled with that abundance of seasonable reflection and suggestion, out of which he will find it easy and even urgent for his mouth to speak. We cannot, therefore, admit the necessary truth of the following sentiment:

"I believe that the amount of expression required from Ministers of Religion is excessive and disproportionate,—that it shuts out a large experience, that it trenches upon truth of spirit and freedom of life,—and that the results which are deplored, the feeble fruits that have now become the measure of expectation, are only natural and inevitable."*

Nor can we admit that a minister's office necessarily disqualifies him from sympathizing with his people, feeling with them in their sorrows as a fellow-worshipper and fellow-mourner, as the following deeply touching passage seems to imply:

"So far as the future is concerned, I am sustained by the belief that many needful influences may be exerted upon you which were not possible to me,—and that all that is possible to me, in the genuine offices of personal religious friendship, may, for some years at least, not only remain but be enhanced. For these personal relations have been largely closed against me by the imperative necessity that the ministrations of Religion should come in thoughts and words, however in consequence they might fail to come in work and life. No one can tell how often I have missed what *could* have been done, what ought to have been done, by the anxious search for what had only to be *said*, and the haunting fear that the search would be in vain. The failures you could witness; the times when weekly Duties were not freshly discharged you could number if you chose; but the waste and exhaustion of unfruitful attempts, the loss of cheerful energy, and the sense of remorse, you could not know, and hardly could suspect. My heart, my door, has been shut by this cloud of preparation, not the less oppressive because so often it was barren, and gave no sign to *you* that it had rested upon me. Nay, even Sympathy has been turned aside from its natural course, by the thought of having to meet God's great occasions with *words*, and by the dread of not being able to meet them with the fitting incitements and consolations. How often have I felt, when the great Teacher was Himself dealing directly with the hearts of others, that it was profane for man to interfere,—for that the lessons were such as words could not convey, and yet could spoil! How often have I desired, in the moments of your affliction and mine, that I too might be silent, and sin not with my tongue! It is always a great trial, and often a great injury, instead of being placed like others under the teachings of Discipline, waiting in patience for the heavenly message and instruction, to have to exhibit the lesson at once as though you understood it all; to have to rise above the circumstances that yet are pressing upon you, and instead of lying

in quietness under the Divine Hand, to have to become the spokesman of God. I am quite prepared to find that this is a suffering and a trial, the extent, and the existence, of which has not been suspected. Only experience can make it known; and I should be silent about it still, if in disclosing it I was begging sympathy or consideration for myself. But others may have the benefit of my confessions, and I may tell you, now, that in all such times, with every sincere man who strives to speak from out the heart of things, as their necessary price his thoughts and words are wrung from him, drop by drop, through whole days of pain. And therefore, for the very sake of a free and natural sympathy, I desire for a time to be at liberty to feel with and for others, without the instant necessity of placing myself in a position different from theirs: nay, I say it with fear, I desire to know and test the natural directions of my own heart and spirit, when it shall no more fall officially upon me to look out for the *Lessons of things.*”*

We may safely venture to affirm that no one but Mr. Thom himself ever thought him unequal or unsuited to “God’s great occasions,” so reverently referred to above. How, indeed, could a gifted minister who so felt the greatness of such occasions, fail to speak words which, however far they might fall below his own inaccessible standard (as is ever the case with man’s highest efforts), would immeasurably enhance both the impressiveness and the significance of the occasion to all who heard? It is well known to be one of Mr. Thom’s characteristic excellences that he always rises to the level of a great occasion, and proves himself to be thoroughly worthy of it, if not the master of it, imparting to it an original, yet wise and legitimate lesson.

We must be allowed to add that we cannot comprehend Mr. Thom’s declared inability to exert a personal influence over his people by friendly advice in the capacity of their minister, which he will have no scruple in doing when he is simply a fellow-worshipper.

“In those years to which I look, when I shall have the happiness of being a fellow-worker and a fellow-worshipper in this Congregation; there are many efforts from which I shall feel in nowise restrained, on which because of my very office I have hitherto feared to venture. This is not a time to speak of the shortcomings of any but myself,—but I cannot forget those shortcomings which have been through me. I have had a great, perhaps too sensitive a dread, of official influence. I reverence beyond all things human the rights of the individual spirit, the true movements of its inward life,—and knowing as you do my scorn of the sacerdotal character, and my intense faith in the priesthood of every man’s soul, if you desired more of personal intercourse on religious things it was yours to seek it, and to accord the privilege which you knew I did not claim. Yet I am aware that many things might have been done, that much more of external prosperity might have attached to many of our Institutions, that, for instance, some of our sacred offices might have been more numerously observed, and a more zealous co-operation attracted towards our Schools and Missions, had I possessed

in larger measure the faculty of making a safe use of personal persuasion. Especially in matters affecting the truthfulness of the inward life, and in all outward professions of spiritual allegiance, the more I have felt that I might have had a power, the more have I feared to exert it. For the individual movement and conviction are essential to truth and healthy growth, and compliance with the persuasion of another might pervert the whole character of a man's soul. There is a period, for example, in every fresh life when God's voice is clearest, and the difficulties of experience are least known, when therefore spiritual enthusiasm is at its height. And when ruling convictions thus assume their natural ascendancy and rise in majesty upon the youthful soul, they ought by some special Act of self-dedication to be solemnly enthroned, installed in the presence of God in clear sight of the sacrifices they demand, and have the great burden of Duty laid upon them. With us the Lord's Supper is the natural occasion for first taking that great vow of Life, and renewing it from time to time; and though we have had no reason here to mark that decline in the observance of this mighty Service, which is said elsewhere to be growing in our Churches, yet I confess I have sought in vain to understand the separation of some with whom such susceptibility would have been good,—and of some ardent and devout minds who have not had the prejudices of age to overcome, and who knew well that no abuse was to be feared,—and especially have I witnessed with sorrowful wonder, the feebleness of sympathy, or the slow ripeness of individual life, which could permit daughters to leave their mothers, or mothers to leave their daughters, to take these vows alone. In future I shall not feel the least hesitation, as friend with friend, to seek in personal communion the living root of all such things,—when I shall no more have the fear of official injury, or that a compliance might be accorded through a mere reluctance to give pain.—So far, therefore, I can hope that the best part of our religious relations, almost all that belongs to real as distinct from official life, may not only remain but be enhanced.”*

There is no good thing that may not be abused, but we cannot understand why “a sensitive dread of official influence,” or a “scorn of the sacerdotal character,” should necessitate the extreme of doing nothing. If Mr. Thom's successor (whoever he may ultimately be) be of opinion, unlike himself, that it is part of his ministerial duty to throw the whole weight of his personal influence into his work,—to make himself the pastor, the friend, the adviser, the associate in benevolent labour, as well as the preacher,—the delicate question forces itself upon us, will Mr. Thom then feel that he can with propriety and advantage exert his own strong personal influence, as former minister and existing member, in a different, possibly in an opposite, direction?

One word, again, as to the alleged or implied contrast between a minister's duty as a preacher and his other professional duties. Does not almost the whole of a minister's most practical duty lie in words, in the endeavour to instruct, direct or influence the minds of others? Whether he have classes for the young, or

* Pp. 17—19.

originate and superintend the working of schools and missions, or give earnest and affectionate counsel to the tempted or the fallen, or soothe the afflicted with Christian sympathy, or cheer the dying and sustain the bereaved with solemn and immortal hope, or in any other way devote himself to properly ministerial duty, his specific work is to *speak*, or to be preparing himself to speak, with seasonable and appropriate effect. As well might an author deprecate the use of the pen, or a warrior the use of his sword, as a minister of Christ the use of speech. Of course it must be genuine speech, to be worth anything. To borrow Mr. Thom's striking expressions, a true preacher must be responded to by the "earnestness of the souls" of his hearers, and not submit, or be required, "to play on the surface of their natures." But, however varying in quality and susceptible of improvement in the keenness of its temper and the directness of its stroke, speech is the religious minister's great and indispensable instrument. It is the proper and distinctive aim of his office to prove, in reference to man's spiritual condition, "how forcible are right words."

By those whom our eloquent author's refined sensibility of temperament and beauty of diction fascinate and carry away, we shall perhaps be deemed prosaic and unappreciating in some of the remarks which we have ventured to offer, and it is only honest that we should deprecate the inference that in our own personal experience the ministerial profession has been wholly free from difficulty, misgiving or depression; but conscience and humility assure us that whatever may have been unhappy in our experience, has arisen from accidental failings or peculiarities in ourselves, rather than from the necessities of our profession. We know too well that at times it is very possible to acquire a feeling of contempt and loathing for much of the *sermonizing* in vogue, as nothing better than a sort of twaddling, gossiping comment upon things in general, as superficial, powerless and useless in relation to the deep problems of life and the actual conduct of human affairs, as the platitudes of a Greek chorus in relation to the action and passion of the drama. But there is, for true ministers of Christ, an attainable kind of speech, not necessarily gifted with genius or with anything that could claim to be called saintly inspiration—speech proceeding from a devout and sympathizing heart, which goes to the heart, and is diffused thence in blessed influence on the life.

There are some exquisitely beautiful portions of the discourse before us on which we have purposely refrained from dwelling, because they touch most tenderly on personal reminiscences and relations between the pastor and his people; but we will not refrain from setting prominently forth the following passages on the proper work and true position of Unitarian Dissenters:

"You are set as a Witness; and you cannot wax low or faint without

the darkness thickening. The Lights are all too few for any one of them to fall out of its sky. And the work to be done, the peculiar work in the Christian world that you only can do, is too vast for any organization, now pledged to the doing it, to be weakened or broken. The world is fast ripening for great religious changes; it waits only for bright and clear Testimonies to the practical Power of the very Truth *you* hold,—and these Testimonies will now best be given in unmistakeable manifestations of the religious Life in connexion with views that Conscience and Reason can accept. Believe me that the time is past for Controversy and the Pulpit to settle these things—the world is thirsting not for Theories, but for great good works of Faith—for practical solutions of the spiritual difficulties of Society—for the harmony of Light and Life—and wherever these appear it will now accept them gladly as bearing the manifest signatures of God. This is the Work that remains for this and the next generation of Unitarians,—to hold before the world the clear signs of a genuine religious Enthusiasm; of spiritual aspirations that rise into toil and sacrifice as their natural sphere; of a practical devotion to God and Christ and the Heavenly kingdom upon Earth, in combination with a large and reconciling Truth, with Freedom, and with Love. This is the work that remains to supplement and glorify all our Controversies.”*

“Your distinguishing Principles are clear as the Sunlight, and may be stated in two sentences. You are *DISSENTERS*, not because *you have* the Truth, but because *you have*; and shall ever have, Freedom *to find it*; that in the faith of Progress you may worship the God who gives you light. You are *UNITARIANS*, because *you are not*, and will not be, *Sectarians*; because you see clearly that the folds whose fences are speculative orthodoxies must always exclude some portion of the flock of Christ,—and that the principle of the Church Universal, as laid down in the Saviour’s Prayer,—that all men should be one with the Father even as he was,—is simply the recognition of the Image of God in Human Nature. Some of you, most of you, have given me a pledge that we should work together to adorn the Doctrine we profess. The time will come when I shall ask you to redeem it.”†

We will not part with the conscientious and earnest preacher, to whose powerful and truly remarkable discourse we have ventured to take some exception, without expressing our warm and cordial hope (in which we are sure the members of his congregation and all who know him will join us) that a mind so deeply spiritual and so richly gifted, a pen so able and a tongue so eloquent, may ere long, after the period of needed rest, again come forth with freshened energy for their rightful and immortal work in saving human souls.

* Pp. 21, 22.

† Pp. 23, 24.

SOME ACCOUNT OF REV. PETER WITHERINGTON, ONCE MINISTER
OF CHESTER AND BOLTON.

A VALUED correspondent has called our attention to the accidental omission from the recently published roll of Bolton ministers of Rev. Peter Withington, and supplied us with a few particulars respecting him, which, together with other facts which we have since gathered, we offer to our readers' acceptance, and shall be happy to receive further information respecting him.

Of his birth-place, family connections and place of education, we have no knowledge. He was born in the memorable year of the Revolution, 1688. The first record we have met with of him occurs in the minutes of the Cheshire Classis. Under the date, Aug. 4, 1713, it is recorded that he appeared as a candidate for ordination. It was not unusual for young ministers to enter previous to ordination on many of the duties of the ministry, especially as assistants to older ministers. At Chester, Mr. Robt. Murrey was the assistant minister, and on his removal to Burton-on-Trent, Mr. Withington became the assistant of the Rev. John Gardner, who had succeeded Matthew Henry. It may be adduced as a sufficient proof that previous to ordination ministers amongst the English Presbyterians were at this time deemed qualified to undertake important pulpit duties, that Mr. Withington preached at Crooks Lane on Thursday, June 24, the day before Mr. Matthew Henry's burial in Trinity church, in the immediate vicinity of the Crooks-Lane chapel, Chester, a sermon in reference to the sad event. He also preached on the following Sunday one of the funeral sermons, from the words, "Weep not for me."* There were many circumstances contributing to the painful interest of these occasional services. The chapel in which Mr. Withington preached had been built for Matthew Henry, and on the previous Sunday, June 20, he had once more addressed to his former flock an affectionate address on the rest that remaineth for the people of God, from Heb. iv. 1. Only ten days before (June 15), many of those who assisted at the funeral had met Mr. Henry at Knutsford, and had witnessed or taken part in the ordination of Mr. William Buckley, of Dukinfield, on which occasion Mr. Henry put the questions, received the confession of faith, offered the ordaining prayer, and gave the exhortation. At that meeting, too, arrangements were made for the ordination of Mr. Withington himself and two other young ministers. The Cheshire minutes contain many entries by Matthew Henry. The last contains the record of Mr. Buckley's ordination, and, being so soon followed by the decease of the pious and gifted writer, has often been looked at with interest by his Presbyterian descendants in the county.

* Mrs. Savage's Diary (MS.).

On the 3rd of August following, another ordination was held at Knutsford. The persons ordained with Mr. Withington were Mr. John Whittaker, and Mr. Thomas Holland, of Wem. Mr. Withington presented a thesis entitled, "An Scriptura Sacra sit sufficiens Regula (Norma) Fidei et Morum." He argued it affirmatively. Mr. Gardner, of Chester, preached; Mr. Aldred, of Monton, took the confession; Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Charles Owen offered the ordaining prayer for Mr. Withington (perhaps he had been Mr. Withington's tutor); and Dr. Holland gave the exhortation to the newly-ordained ministers, from Acts xx. 28.

During the years 1715, 1717, 1718 and 1719, Mr. Withington continued to attend the meetings of the Classis. In the last-named year, he received the compliment of being appointed preacher to the Assembly; and the text of his sermon, like the subject of his thesis at ordination, shews his interest in the great Protestant principles of the sufficiency of Scripture and the right of private judgment, being 1 Thess. v. 21, "Prove all things—hold fast that which is good." In the following year, 1720, Mr. Withington removed to Bolton, and his name no more appears in the Cheshire minutes.

Our correspondent is inclined to think that, in removing to Bolton, Mr. Withington went not merely as assistant minister, but as a pastor. It is not easy, however, to reconcile this supposition with the circumstance of no trace of him having been discovered at Bolton by the recent intelligent local historian.

The fact, however, of there being a second minister at Bolton during the early years of Dr. Dixon's settlement, serves in a remarkable way to confirm our suggestion that the last-named gentleman studied and took his degrees, both in Medicine and Arts, at Glasgow, or at least some Scottish University, after his removal into Lancashire. He could well be spared by his Bolton flock during the winter months, if they enjoyed the pulpit and pastoral services of an experienced minister like Mr. Withington. The belief of our correspondent that Mr. Withington was the pastor at Bolton, is countenanced by the notice of him contained in the MSS. of the late Walter Wilson, which begins thus—"Peter Withington, assistant to Mr. Gardner at Chester, removed, 1720, to be pastor at Bolton."

His life soon came to an end. He died at Scarborough in the month of June, 1722. In the diary of a Lancashire lady, in the possession of our correspondent, there is an entry, under the date July 1, 1722, which serves to shew the estimation in which Mr. Withington was held: "— preached to-day, from Psalm i. 6; but I was strangely surprised when the travellers came to the chapel in the afternoon" (Rochdale is the place). "They came from Scarborough, with mourning in their hats, and when I inquired the reason, I was told that Mr. Withington, the minister at Bolton, was dead, and interred at Scarborough. His life was

very desirable, but God will let us see that he can carry on his own work by what hands he pleaseth, and I must own God is righteous, though his ways are past finding out. He is, it is true, taken away in the midst of his usefulness, and when, to all human appearance, he could ill have been spared; but he has run his race fast and well, and has now won the prize. He hath reached the goal, got to his everlasting rest, where he needs neither sin, fear nor sorrow. He met death when he was in hopes to have his health restored; and indeed it was so, though not in the way his friends desired; but God, the wise Orderer of all things, saw much to do, and who shall say unto God, What doest thou?"

In the Appendix to Gent's History of Hull, the inscription on Mr. Withington's gravestone at Scarborough is preserved: "The Rev. Mr. Peter Withington, late of Bolton in le Moors, Lancashire, died in 1722, aged 34. *I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness.*"

The only other fact connected with Mr. Withington of which we have found any record, is that he was the catechist appointed by Mr. Hulton's Trustees, for three years after Mr. Bourne's death, viz. 1719 to 1721.

It is remarkable that in the only printed account of the succession of ministers at Chester (in Dr. Piggot's History, furnished by the late Rev. James Lyons), the name of Mr. Withington finds no place. The faithful Nonconformist minister wins by laborious and barely recompensed service his title to respect, that of posterity as well as contemporaries, and we feel a pleasure in restoring to his place in the calendar of worthies, the name of Peter Withington.

MR. BAKER ON HIS HISTORY OF BOLTON NONCONFORMITY.

SIR,

AFTER a careful reconsideration of the circumstances mentioned in my "Historical Sketch of the Rise and Progress of Nonconformity in Bolton," relative to different members of the family of the Hollands, and more particularly to Rev. Philip Holland, which have called forth some corrections from your respected correspondent, Rev. T. Crompton Holland, of Loughborough, I am fully confirmed in the accuracy of my statements, and must request a small space for the following brief remarks.

1. Your correspondent thinks that "Rev. Philip Holland never was minister at Wem" (p. 488). In a short biographical preface to two posthumous volumes of Rev. Philip Holland's Sermons, edited by Rev. John Holland and Rev. William Turner, Jun., it is explicitly stated, "At Wem he succeeded his father, and from Wem came to Bolton in Lancashire" (p. iv).

2. Your correspondent affirms that "Rev. Thomas Holland only

brought up two of his sons to the ministry, namely, Philip, and Henry, afterwards minister at Ormskirk" (p. 488). The biographers of Rev. Philip Holland state that "his father, Thomas Holland, a Dissenting minister at Wem in Shropshire (whose yearly salary consisted chiefly of presents of the necessaries of life), brought up a large family of children, and sent *three* sons to the Dissenting academies in Northamptonshire" (Preface, p. iv.). These three sons were—1, Philip, who spent the greater part of his ministerial life at Bolton; 2, John, who, after passing some years in the Presbyterian ministry at Wem and Allostock, conformed in 1763; and, 3, Henry, who first settled at Prescot and subsequently removed to Ormskirk.

There was also another John, son of Mr. John Holland, of Mobberley, who was educated at Kendal and Glasgow, and who died of a fever, in the thirty-first year of his age, Dec. 28, 1751, just as he had accepted an invitation from the Presbyterian congregation at Chowbent. Two volumes of his Sermons were published after his death. (Mon. Repos. V. 327.)

3. Your correspondent's next correction relates to the place of Rev. Philip Holland's education, and is also at variance with the statement of his biographers. Mr. T. C. Holland's words are—"Again, Rev. Philip Holland was, I believe, a pupil of Dr. Rotheram's, of Kendal" (p. 488). The biographers say that "Philip, the oldest of the three sons, was a pupil of the learned, amiable and pious Dr. Doddridge" (Preface, p. iv.). He entered the Academy at Northampton in 1739, at the age of eighteen. Had he ever been at Kendal, his name would have been found in the published list of Dr. Rotheram's pupils.

The above statements, as far as they relate to Rev. Philip Holland, mainly rest on the authority of Rev. John Holland and Rev. William Turner, Jun. Nor is it easy for me to think that they were mistaken in their facts, both of them being men of remarkable accuracy and wonderful memory. If Mr. T. C. Holland is in possession of manuscript evidence at variance with these particulars, it would be desirable that it should be brought forward. Until that is done, I must be excused for adhering to the statements in the Lectures controverted by your correspondent, namely, that "the Rev. Philip Holland removed hither from Wem, in Shropshire, in the autumn of 1755," and that "his father, the Rev. Thomas Holland, had been his predecessor at Wem, and had brought up two other sons, besides his eldest son Philip, to the ministry at the Dissenting Academy in Northamptonshire, then under the direction of Dr. Doddridge" (Lectures, pp. 58, 59).

Mr. T. C. Holland is probably correct in his claims for his father's portion of one, at least, of two school publications assigned to Rev. John Holland, and I feel obliged to him for the correction.

Permit me to remark, in conclusion, that your reviewer has fallen into a mistake in describing the Rev. John Holland as the "son" of Philip (p. 487). He was his nephew.

Bolton, Aug. 16, 1854.

FRANKLIN BAKER.

In confirmation of Mr. Baker's statements, we add some extracts from the MS. diary of Mrs. Savage, a daughter of Philip Henry:

"1716, Oct. 11. Son Lawrence came" (Mr. William Lawrence, of the Moat House, near Wem, married Mrs. Savage's eldest daughter

Sarah, at Wrenbury church, Dec. 29, 1713), “and their new minister, Mr. Holland.

“1717, Wednesday, Feb. 20. I had to-night a letter from Mr. Holland, a proposal for our third daughter Mary, which somewhat surprised me. I thought of that of Luther, ‘I’ll tell God of it.’ I find an unspeakable satisfaction in any difficulty to have such a Friend whom I can be free with. ‘Lord! what wilt thou have us to do?’

“Oct. 30. Mr. Holland came from Wem, and his brother from Mobberley met him, and concluded as to the forementioned affair. They agree to a publication in church, desirous not so far to own the Bishops (as to have a licence), which many have thought a public grievance.

“Friday, Nov. 1. The first time they were published.

“Nov. 7. Daughter Mary was married to Mr. Holland. My husband, self, children and niece, H. Tylston, Mr. Holland, of Mobberley, and young Mr. Vaudrey, the minister, attended them.

“Nov. 15. Mr. Holland took his new-married wife to Moat House.

“1738, July 22. Philip Holland shortly to go to Dr. Doddridge. (He afterwards was invited to Wolverhampton; on the death of his father he removed to Wem, where he stayed but a short time, being invited to Bolton, where he died.*)

“1742, April 15. Good tidings from Shropshire. P. Holland began to preach.

“1744. John Holland comes, in his way to Northampton.”

ORTHODOXY.

WHAT is this thing called Orthodoxy, which mars the fortunes of honest men, misleads the judgment of princes, and occasionally endangers the stability of thrones? In the true meaning of the term, it is a sacred thing to which every denomination of Christians lays an arrogant and exclusive claim, but to which no man, no assembly of men, since the apostolic age, can prove a title. It is frequently amongst individuals of the same sect nothing better than self-sufficiency of opinion and pharisaical pride, by which each man esteems himself more righteous than his neighbours. It may, perhaps, be useful in cementing what is called the *alliance* between Church and State; but if such an alliance obstructs candid discussions, if it invades the right of private judgment, if it generates bigotry in Churchmen or intolerance in Statesmen, it not only becomes inconsistent with the general principles of Protestantism, but it impedes the progress of the kingdom of Christ, which we all know is not of this world.—*Bishop Watson.*

* The passage in parenthesis is added by another hand.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Relation between Judaism and Christianity, illustrated in Notes on Passages in the New Testament containing Quotations from, or References to, the Old. By John Gorham Palfrey, D.D., LL.D. 8vo. Pp. 344. Boston (U.S.). 1854.

In this goodly volume Dr. Palfrey presents us with a supplement to his larger work, "Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities," of which the two concluding volumes were reviewed a year or two ago in these pages, under a well-known and much-respected signature. Those who are acquainted with the author's previous writings will expect, and will find, in the present work, proofs of good sense, united with a fair degree of learning, accompanied at times by some unnecessary diffuseness, and even, it may be, an occasional want of clearness and force in the statements and arguments employed. The latter fault cannot, however, be said to be a common one in Dr. Palfrey's writings, which are generally characterized by plainness and simplicity of language. We can generally see his meaning easily enough, and he usually *has* a meaning also which he wishes us to see, although, as we have hinted, it might be stated occasionally in somewhat fewer words.

The purpose of the volume before us is to support the conclusions of the work on the Old Testament, by an examination of those passages of the New in which the former is referred to or quoted. And, in particular, Dr. Palfrey has brought together for explanation all the passages which appear to have been regarded by the New Testament writers as prophetically descriptive of the Messiah, or of incidents in his life; and he endeavours to shew us that there is nothing in such passages, rightly interpreted, inconsistent with the views respecting the Old Testament put forth in the Academical Lectures,—nothing inconsistent with such views, and much in their favour.

The conclusions alluded to are briefly as follows:—That the Pentateuch is substantially the work of Moses, "the divinely-authorized revealer of the Jewish religion;" the book of Genesis being a compilation from family traditions and other sources of little historical authority, and intended as a kind of preface to the Law, giving sanction to the latter by shewing that its provisions were in accordance with ancient opinion;—"that the revelation of Judaism, and all miraculous administration of the Jewish nation, terminated with the age of Moses;"—that the historical books later than Moses "have no other authority than that of works of other historical writers of a rude age," containing some truth, with much that is untrue and incredible, for which Christianity is in no way responsible;—that from Moses to Christ, no man is represented by either Testament as having been supernaturally informed of any future event, the office of a prophet not being that of a foreteller of events; the Messianic expectations expressed by the prophets were to a great extent incorrect, and, so far as correct, were founded on a declaration of Moses and earlier revelations to the patriarchs, and there is no evidence of their fulfilment such as to shew them to have been supernaturally suggested;—that the miscellaneous writings of the Old Testament, such as the Psalms and Proverbs, are simply the remaining literature of the nation, written under

the influence of the Mosaic law and religion; they are not the productions of men miraculously endowed in any way, and are "destitute of any peculiar authority." These are important propositions, and one or two of them of very doubtful character. The whole tendency of Dr. Palfrey's scheme, it is evident, is to make Moses and the Law the great and predominant authorities in the Old Testament. Many will certainly demur to the very subordinate rank which he attributes to the Prophets, who, he tells us, knew nothing "correct" of the Messiah, but what they had learnt from Moses or the revelations of earlier times. In the present state of the question as to the origin and authorship of the Pentateuch, such a position as this is at best a most insecure one. Our author himself, in that portion of his Academical Lectures in which he treats of that question, has, in the estimation of some judges, merely shewn, and that not always conclusively, the *possibility* of reconciling the contents of the Pentateuch with the supposition of its Mosaic origin. How far this is from establishing the "conclusion" that it "was written by Moses," it requires but little penetration to discover.

But these remarks of ours seem to refer rather to the former work of Dr. Palfrey than to the present. The object of the new work, as we have said, is to explain passages quoted from the Old Testament in the New, especially such as are taken by the various writers of the latter as relating to the Messiah, and actually applied by them to Jesus Christ. The main point is to vindicate those writers from the imputation of having understood what did not originally relate to Christ, as being strictly and properly fulfilled in him; in such instances, for example, as Matt. i. 22, 23. In this case it would appear that the evangelist regarded the prophet as having had the birth of Christ definitely in his mind, and as having delivered a definite prophecy, which was fulfilled in the circumstances attending that birth. But this, says Dr. Palfrey, is a wrong interpretation. "Matthew merely meant to say, in the use of a customary device of rhetorick, that words, used by that ancient writer in an entirely different application, might be adopted as applicable to those circumstances of the birth of Jesus which he, Matthew, was now describing." (P. 33.) The verses referred to, introduced by the words, "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled," &c., form a kind of proof passage, and the explanation of other places is dependent on the view taken of them. We wish we could think Dr. Palfrey successful in his endeavour to shew that we have here a mere device of rhetoric; but we cannot do so. The subject is one of considerable importance, and at the same time one of some difficulty. We regret that we cannot exhibit our author's view without quoting his statements at undue length. What he says amounts very much to the assertion that the evangelist, in such instances as the above, intended simply to suggest that a result was accomplished corresponding, in some general sense, to the quoted words, so that these might be considered as "made good," verified, "fulfilled," in that result. Accordingly the words, "that it might be fulfilled," would more properly be rendered, "so that it was fulfilled," or in some equivalent way,—which of course is no new view of the subject, as may be seen by looking into the corrected version of the Gospels given in the Harmony of the late Dr. Carpenter. It cannot be denied that much that is ingenious and forcible is adduced by Dr. Palfrey in support of his interpretation. Much, however, of what he says, betrays a certain

want of ease, directness, and harmony with other *data*, such as would hardly be found were the explanation proposed the correct and natural one. We should prefer to accept the difficulty, and allow it its real weight, as did the late Professor Norton, to whose opinion on the subject Dr. Palfrey refers with disapproval (Pref. p. xiv.), rather than to admit any doubtful or artificial removal of it.

One of the shorter examples of the application of the proposed method is the following; and we quote the passage at length, in order to give a fair and entire instance of this class of Dr. Palfrey's explanations. The passage referred to is Matt. ii. 14, 15, "When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night and departed into Egypt, and was there until the death of Herod, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, 'Out of Egypt have I called my son.'" On this citation of the Old Testament we have the following remarks :

"The reference is to the prophecy of Hosea (xi. 1), where we read as follows: 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt.' The words are part of a discourse which, by the rhetorical device so common with the prophets ('Lectures,' &c., Vol. II. pp. 415—417), and not uncommon with other writers, Jehovah is represented as uttering. It is, therefore, with strict propriety that the evangelist quotes them as 'spoken of the Lord by [or *in*] the prophet.'

"It is perfectly evident that by the original words Hosea intended no prediction whatever. The Septuagint text reads, 'Out of Egypt have I called *his* [Israel's] children.' But that is immaterial. Whether Jehovah's *son*, or Israel's *children*, nothing can be clearer than that it is the Jewish people that is here signified (comp. Ex. iv. 22, 23), and that its past conduct and fortunes, and not any future events, are the subject of the passage. In the infancy of the nation, Jehovah, through his love for them, led them out of Egypt by the ministry of Moses (Hos. xi. 1). They strayed into idolatrous practices (ibid. 2), yet he did not renounce them, but dealt forbearingly and tenderly with them (ibid. 4), and so on. There is not a word here which it is possible to understand as spoken by Hosea of the future Messiah in any sense. Whatever we may think of Matthew's capacity and authority as an interpreter of the Old Testament,—whether we ascribe to him infallible knowledge, or only the most limited knowledge compatible with the smallest degree of common sense,—it is impossible to imagine that he could understand Hosea as speaking here of the future Messiah.

"So clear is this case, that I consider the text as having the highest importance in its bearing on the general argument respecting the force of quotations from the Old Testament in the New. If Matthew, calling to mind a passage of Hosea, in which, in terms so plain that Matthew could not misunderstand them, the exodus of the people was referred to historically, could quote the words in reference to an event seven or eight hundred years subsequent to the quoted writer, then it is as certain as anything of the kind can be, that Matthew did not intend to represent that event as accomplishing a prediction contained in those words. And if, in such a case as this, when the supposition of prediction accomplished is absolutely preposterous and out of the question, the evangelist could introduce his quotation with the formal words, '*that it might be fulfilled* which was spoken *of* the Lord by the prophet,' then it follows, that in no case whatever does the formality of that introduction permit us to infer that the evangelist points to the words which he quotes as containing a prediction, of which events have brought about the accomplishment.

"Matthew simply suggests, in reference to the return of Jesus in his childhood from Egypt to Palestine, that God, in accomplishing the second great deliverance for his people, may be said to have done what the prophet had said he did in accomplishing the first; that is, to have called his Son out of

Egypt. And this is the nature of quotations of this kind, of which such a great mystery and perplexity has been made."—Pp. 40—42.

It is evident that, in writing thus, our author really passes over the question whether the evangelists and their contemporaries may not, in their want of knowledge respecting the original meaning and application of much in their ancient Scriptures, have actually come to accept many passages as containing predictions of the Messiah and the incidents of his life, and at the same time have regarded various circumstances and occurrences in the history of Jesus as the destined fulfilment of such predictions. The Jews of Christ's time believed in demoniacal possessions; so, doubtless, did most of the early Christians. Was there not the same participation, on the part of the latter, in the prevailing views respecting the Messianic passages of the Old Testament? and did not the evangelists, in short, think on this subject like the rest of their countrymen? Moreover, when incidents took place in connection with Christ which were *contrary* to all their previous expectations,—when they saw the lowly condition, the sufferings and death of the Messiah,—did they not then, enlightened by the *event*, further *understand the Scriptures* by finding in them prophecies even of these unlooked-for occurrences? and was not this correspondence of fact with ancient prediction among the grounds of their conviction of the claims of Jesus? And here, again, arises an important question which Dr. Palfrey does not touch. Were facts or events in Christ's life, in any case or in many cases, originated, i.e. imagined or invented, under the influence or dictation of misunderstood prophecy,—facts or events which did not really occur, but were only supposed to have occurred, because needed for the fulfilment of ancient predictions? So asserts the author of the *Leben Jesu*, and many others of his, or some kindred, way of thinking. But the reverse process appears to have been more nearly what took place; viz. that actual occurrences, visible facts, seen and known in the life of Christ, some of them strange and altogether unexpected, were *after the event* discovered to have been predicted; and this is as much as to say, not that the prophecy originated the event, but rather that the event originated, or gave its significance to, the previously unrecognized or uninterpreted prophecy. This position, we believe, can be well established; and in it we have manifestly a strong defence against the imputation of a mythical origin of the gospel history.

The conclusion which we think the most probable one, may be stated briefly as follows. We of these later times, with our better understanding of the Hebrew Scriptures, and our knowledge of the first intention and application of various passages, can see that the supposed predictions do not originally relate to Jesus Christ at all, and, in fact, that there is perhaps no definite prophecy of him personally in the whole of the Old Testament. But the Jews of Christ's day did not see this. They were very poor interpreters of their own Scriptures, and had not the historical knowledge of the centuries preceding the captivity which the modern reader may acquire. Hence their misinterpretation of many passages,—their moral and allegorical and prophetic senses, where none were originally intended. Interpreters of our day, indeed, and Dr. Palfrey as clearly as any one, may see that the prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, could not have meant, in certain cases, to refer specifically to Christ; but this does not settle the question whether the evangelists and first Chris-

tians in general saw the same thing as clearly. We think that, with their education and modes of thought as Jews, they could not; and, consequently, that the respected author of this volume very much misses the real solution of the difficulty about which he is concerned.

The Sabbath; or an Examination of the Six Texts commonly adduced from the New Testament in Proof of a Christian Sabbath. By a Layman.* 8vo. Pp. 338. 1849. With a Supplement. Pp. xxxvi. 1853. London—Chapman and Hall, 186, Strand.

THE venerable octogenarian, who has produced this work, has thereby rendered an important service to sacred literature. The proper grounds for the observance of Sunday, and the way, in which it ought to be observed, now attract as much attention as ever, and yet the question is very little understood. Many good persons insist upon observing the day with extreme rigour, and those, who incline to indulgence or laxity, can scarcely do so without some offence to their own misdirected or unenlightened conscience; while to multitudes of the idle, the ignorant, and the dissipated, the day is further removed from being sacred than any other in the week. The work above quoted is principally written in reply to the “Brief Remarks on the History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath,” by the late Joseph John Gurney, who was so celebrated for his charity to the poor. The author at the same time replies to the Rev. T. S. Hughes’s “Letter to Godfrey Higgins, Esq., on the Subject of his Horæ Sabbaticæ;” and he also considers with sufficient fulness the arguments of Dr. Paley in his Moral Philosophy, so far as he adduces the authority of scripture. The Supplement is an examination of certain evidence adduced from the Fathers, in a work entitled “The Christian Sabbath,” by the Rev. George Holden, M.A.

The Layman frequently expresses his opinion in favour of the long-established practice of keeping one day in seven as a day of comparative rest from labour, and of employing it, not only in innocent and salutary recreation, but in acts of devotion and in religious instruction and exhortation. The great design of his work is to prove that this practice is not established or recommended by any New-Testament authority, however much it may be recommended by its moral and social advantages. To establish this point, he examines “the Six Texts commonly adduced from the New Testament in Proof of the Christian Sabbath.” These texts, which Mr. Gurney regards as decisive, are John xx. 19, 26; Acts ii. 1, xx. 6, 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2; Rev. i. 10; and whilst the first layman, Mr. Gurney, treats them in a style of criticism as careless as it is confident and positive, the second investigates their true import with the most laudable diligence and accuracy, sifts every portion of the evidence which they really afford or have been supposed to furnish, and shews the utter futility of the arguments founded upon them. He concludes with perfect confidence, that in the Christian Scriptures no warrant is to be found for the belief that we are enjoined by Divine authority to observe “Sunday either as a Sabbath day, or as a stated day of ‘assembling for the purpose of public worship and religious instruction.’” (P. 334.) The utmost that is to be proved from the New Testament is, that independently of any command of Christ or of his apostles, the Christians, as

* Sir William Domville, Bart., of Southfield, Sussex.

early as in the first century, met at least occasionally on the first day of the week, which not long after was called the Lord's-day, and also the day of the sun, or Sunday, to partake of their ordinary evening meal, and that on that day they laid aside something to provide for the wants of their poorer brethren. There is no reason to believe that on that day, or on any other, they abstained from their ordinary avocations; and although the "breaking of bread," which was the commencement of their principal meal, was no doubt accompanied with giving of thanks, and probably with edifying conversation and other religious exercises such as the particular occasion may have suggested, there is no reason to believe that solemn worship was the principal, or the express and only object for which they assembled. About a hundred years later, as we learn from Justin Martyr, "the custom of observing the Sunday as a day of public prayer and other religious exercises, had become generally established among Christians" (p. 273); and at length, in the year 321, the Emperor Constantine issued a decree requiring persons in cities, but not in the country, to observe the Sunday as a Sabbath, that is, as a day of rest from business or ordinary labour. Even in towns no prohibition was imposed upon recreation or innocent amusement. The very strict observance of the Sunday, now observed by some religious persons in this country, originated with the Puritans. It may therefore be called the *Puritanic Sabbath*, to distinguish it from the seventh day, which was kept in the same rigid and arbitrary manner in the time of our Lord and his apostles by the Pharisees, and which may therefore be properly distinguished as the *Pharisaic Sabbath*.

We learn with pleasure that it is the design of our author to pursue the subject of the work before us, by examining the arguments for the sabbatical observance of Sunday derived from the Old Testament. On account of his very advanced age, he has already published in a separate form* that chapter of his proposed work which discusses the question as to the present obligation of the "Mosaic," or, as we should call it, the *Pharisaic Sabbath*. Though somewhat prolix in regard to style, yet the works before us evince so much solid learning, scrupulous accuracy, and conscientious care and diligence, that we would earnestly recommend them to our readers, and we indulge the hope that the discussion of the subject may be ere long brought to a conclusion by the same pen.

J. Y.

The Lamplighter. London—Routledge. 1854.

THIS reprint of an American work is rivalling in popularity "Uncle Tom's Cabin." It is a beautiful story, especially in its earlier portions. The religion which it develops is cheerful, hopeful and practical. Of its authorship we know nothing, but think we are not far wrong in attributing it to an Unitarian. To us the story loses something of its interest after the death of True, who is in every sense the hero and the light of the book.

* The Mosaic Sabbath; or an Inquiry into the supposed Present Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment. Chapman and Hall, 186, Strand. 1850.

INTELLIGENCE.

WESTERN UNITARIAN SOCIETY.

The 63rd annual meeting of this Society was held at Bridgewater on Wednesday, the 19th of July, 1854. There was a very good attendance of ministers and friends from various parts of the country; among them we noticed the Revds. B. Mardon, W. Gaskell, J. Panton Ham, G. B. Brock, W. A. Jones (Taunton), Lewis D. Jones (Lympston), Brooke Herford, W. James, Jerom Murch, D. L. Evans, E. Chapman, — Howse; Messrs. W. Browne, J. Browne, J. Cuffe, T. Lang, C. Thompson, C. Thomas, T. Talbot, C. P. Browne, D. Cobb, &c.

Mr. Ham introduced the service in the morning with earnestness and devotion, and the Rev. W. Gaskell delivered an admirable discourse from John xiv. 9—"He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father."

The preacher forcibly described the circumstances under which the discourse in which the text is found was delivered, the perfect consciousness which Jesus displayed of his approaching sufferings and death, and at the same time the entire self-forgetfulness he manifested, trying to comfort his anxious followers, and preparing consolations, which they would fully comprehend only when he was removed from them. Every remark of the great Master must be full of interest to the true disciple, and the text is in itself very remarkable. The question, therefore, What does it mean? is of high importance to us. The Trinitarians tell us, that although the disciples had not seen it while Christ still was upon earth, yet this and other passages prove that he was God. Our orthodox brethren say, that though his disciples were thus deceived, many chance hearers of the word recognized this and worshiped him. Strange it is that, while those who were constantly with Jesus did not recognize it, yet such accidental listeners should understand this mysterious meaning. But, overlooking this—even accepting the common view—the text, instead of becoming a proof, is only a new difficulty. We are told not to force any meaning, but to take it literally: if we do so, we immediately become heretics, and fall into the error of confounding the persons; for Jesus then is not only equal, but identical with the Father. Although it may

suit controversialists to say they take the passage literally, yet no one does so. We all have some other than a literal interpretation, and yet we can, apart from controversy, find a full meaning for it. Let us consider how spirit can communicate with spirit. Sense sees it not from outward signs and acts. We interpret by our minds what the spirit doeth. Thus it is with man, and thus also with the great Father of all spirits. The universe in every age reveals him, as the Psalmist says (Ps. xix.). Nature is one scripture of God,—divine thought in an outward form, as far as we read it aright, making known the spirit whence it sprung. So also do the affections of the heart and conscience reveal God to us. The purer the conscience, the purer the love of God appears. A good life ever brings us nearer to the knowledge of God, and more into sympathy with him. In history, therefore, we have another manifestation of God. We are led through humanity to God. Through the people of Israel, we have a more special manifestation of the Father. By miracle, they had brought home to their rude understandings the reality of the God they worshiped, and were convinced of his protection and his power to punish sin. He revealed himself to the Jews through lawgivers, sages, psalmists and prophets; thus making Israel his peculiar people, and inspiring their literature with a character that has made it entirely distinct from the productions of every other nation. All these manifestations may be said to lead to God. Still something more was wanted, and in fulness of time Christ came, in whom we have the fullest manifestation of the great incomprehensible Being. In contemplating him, we have at once the highest revelation possible to and through humanity. In the universe, the power of God is shewn; but this is even more apparent in the miracles of Christ, as it is there more directly shewn. In the universe, the wisdom of God is shewn; but it is more impressive in the knowledge of men's hearts and purposes which is displayed in the ministry of Christ. In the providence of creation, we can find proof of God's love; but never so clearly as in the life and character of Christ. There can be no error here; no doubt can be left to

obscure our convictions. It was the Father's love that sent him into the world and inspired his every action. In history, our hearts and consciences are brought into connection with holiness, and we learn to love its beauty ; but never so closely as in the contemplation of him in whom was no guile. When we look on Jesus, we need not be at a loss to know what God delights in and requires. It might easily be shewn how much light is thrown by Christ upon nature and humanity, and how the law given to the Jews served as a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ. Christ, then, is the image of the living God, the first-born of every creature, the pure reflection of divine glory given to man. Being the perfect exponent of God, in him we have all we require : he is indeed God manifest in the flesh. The great object of the evangelists is not so much to give a distinct ritual, nor to prove that belief is more important than a good life; but to gather such parts of Christ's life which best place this his true position and mission before us. This is a revelation which all can understand. There is no controversy here, no unholly wrangling ; all agree. It is to make us one with God, even as Christ is one with him. This view, however, is seldom adopted practically ; and in fondness for creeds, from a love of difficult texts, men are led to overlook the direct bearing of the truth communicated by Jesus, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." They are lost in their mysterious interpretations ; for this is one of the great evils of orthodoxy, it hinders the adoption of simple truth. If in Christ we have the direct revelation of God, how clearly does this contradict the leading features of what is called orthodoxy ! They look upon Jesus, so pure and holy, whose every deed is love and mercy, and then they say that he created the human soul impure and corrupt. They see Jesus ever merciful to the penitent, receiving the Magdalen that bathes his feet in tears, and yet they believe that He whose image Jesus was, would reject a penitent, if there were not a full payment made in sacrifice by a vicarious atonement. They believe that the Father cannot forgive any one till a substitute be found to bear the whole burden of his anger. Instead of blending all things in harmony, orthodoxy brings in discord ; dividing the soul with contradictions, filling it with dread of Him whose image only calls forth love. The true view preserves

us against Pantheism, which destroys all religious life ; giving something definite, by the finite image of the Infinite Being, instead of the cold abstract worship of beauty, goodness and holiness. Again, it exerts a quickening power upon the affections. The great truths of Christianity might have been given in mere abstract forms, but they would not then have had the influence they now exert. To thousands who know really nothing of the creeds which they profess, this living reality of God's image in Christ is a saving faith. In looking to Christ, they feel a power within their souls stronger than anything merely intellectual. This view also allows room for the mind and conscience to act freely, and keeps the heart from bitterness. If men had only acknowledged that to be a Christian is to be as like Christ as possible, they would not have quarrelled about creeds and differences of opinion. Nothing can be more consoling than the conviction that Christ is the image of God. When we are in sorrow, we remember that he sympathized with grief, and wept at the tomb of Lazarus. When weighed down by conscious guilt, we think how kindly he said, "Thy sins be forgiven thee." When our aspirations are high and our actions fall far short of them, we remember how he found an excuse for his disciples who could not watch an hour : "The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." The great God will judge us mercifully ; for as Christ was, so is our God.

The above abstract gives no fair idea of the beauty, both of thought and expression, which characterized Mr. Gaskell's truly Christian sermon ; and we hope our readers may soon have an opportunity of seeing the whole discourse published by the Western Unitarian Society.

The friends of the Society, both ladies and gentlemen, met at dinner at the Clarence hotel at two o'clock, presided over by John Browne, Esq. After the cloth was removed, and the usual loyal toasts duly honoured, Mr. Mardon, in clear and energetic language, proposed the toast of "Civil and Religious Liberty." Mr. James proposed the health of the visitors, the Revds. G. B. Brock, J. Panton Ham and Brooke Herford, who all briefly responded. The health of Messrs. Gaskell, Chapman, the Chairman, W. Browne and Steinthal, having been proposed and responded to, Mr. Browne proposed the health of the Ladies, to which Mr. James re-

sponded, and the party adjourned till five o'clock, when they met again at tea.

After tea, W. Browne, Esq., took the chair, and various resolutions were proposed and carried. We regret that we are unable to give a full report of the meeting, but must confine ourselves to the briefest abstract.

After the usual routine business of confirming the minutes and appointing the committee for the ensuing year, Mr. Murch proposed a vote of thanks to the preacher of the day for the discourse he had delivered, very justly characterizing it as scriptural in tone and illustration, and peculiarly adapted to the wants of our own church and the necessities of the age. He pointedly alluded to the subject as all-important, the style as clear and eloquent, and the arguments contained in it as conclusive and scriptural; and having gracefully alluded to the other claims which the name of Gaskell has upon our esteem and gratitude, concluded with moving the resolution, which was seconded by T. Lang, Esq., and carried unanimously.

In responding, Mr. Gaskell spoke of the pleasure he had derived from meeting with some old friends in Bridgewater, and from having the opportunity of forming some new acquaintances; and then, in his usual clear and elegant style, spoke of the importance of the great doctrine in particular of which he had spoken in the morning, as well as of true opinions in general; opposing that false liberalism which would make truth a matter of indifference. He shewed how much ignorance prevails with respect to our views, and urged upon all the necessity of greater exertion in the cause of pure Christianity; while at the same time he warned all not to be too sanguine, aptly quoting the quaint saying of Matthew Henry, that we should be careful not to set our clocks before God's dial.

Mr. Odgers then moved, and Mr. John Browne seconded, the following resolution: "That the Committee be requested to take into their early consideration the mode in which the £300 now in the funds may be best employed, with a view to promote the objects of the Society; and that they be hereby authorized to sell out the sum above named, or any part thereof, and to apply it in such way as they may deem most expedient for the purpose of carrying out the wishes of this meeting."

Mr. John Browne proposed: "That

this meeting, consisting of ministers and members of Unitarian congregations in the West of England, whilst rejoicing in the efforts recently made in both houses of Parliament, with a view to extend the advantages of the University of Oxford, by admitting to its studies and distinctions all classes of their fellow-subjects, without reference to sect or creed, and acknowledging the obligations under which they are laid as Dissenters to all those members of the legislature who have advocated their just claims, desire especially to express their gratitude to James Heywood, Esq., M.P., for the energy and ability with which he has sought to remove the oaths on matriculation and the first degrees, and to make the Oxford University Bill, in these respects, conformable to the spirit of the age, and to the demands of a free and enlightened people." He pointed to the causes of rejoicing for the many advantages which had of late years been thrown open to the nation, such as Catholic Emancipation, &c., as well as the opening of the University of Oxford, which he hailed with great pleasure.

Mr. Brock, in seconding the resolution, also expressed his sense of the great importance of the measure, to Unitarians especially. There were few who were aware how much of its success was due to the consummate tact and perseverance of Mr. Heywood.

Mr. James proposed that a copy of the resolution should be sent to Mr. Heywood.

Mr. Gaskell could not forbear to add his testimony to the unwearied exertions used through many years by Mr. Heywood to bring about this object.

Mr. James then moved a resolution expressive of regret for one who had long held so high a place in the Unitarian body, the Rev. J. G. Robberds. Mr. Steinthal seconded the resolution.

Mr. B. Herford proposed: "That this meeting, remembering the great Protestant principle of the right of private judgment which for generations has characterized the English Presbyterian churches, would again assert their perfect faith in the results which must arise from such liberty, and would express their earnest sympathy with all those who in sincerity and singleness of heart search after the truth of God, and would more especially welcome those who have not shrunk from making sacrifices in what they have felt to be the cause of pure Chris-

tianity;" and said a few words expressive of faith in the principles of free inquiry, taking as an instance the Presbyterian church. Its members now differ widely from those of a century ago. He guarded against the wrong use of the term "free inquiry," shewing that in its true meaning it did not lead merely to the rejection of what was false, but also to the holding fast of whatever was felt to be true. He also expressed his sympathy with such men as Mr. Ham and Mr. Forster, who had really made sacrifices for the truth; as well as for Mr. Howorth, who equally deserved our respect.

To this Mr. Ham responded, expressing his thanks for this sympathy. He had for the last five years lived much alone, having been shunned by many of his former friends, who considered that he was arriving at a dangerous position. He, however, felt otherwise. He had suffered much from doubts; but he had now arrived at Unitarian views, and felt at peace. He thought that Unitarians generally did not sufficiently shew their appreciation of the value of their views, and urged more efforts to make them known.

Mr. Jones moved: "That this meeting rejoice to hear of the formation of the Home Missionary Board at Manchester, for the training of young men for the Unitarian ministry to the masses of their countrymen, and commend it to the sympathy and support of the Unitarians of the West of England." After expressing his pleasure at meeting so many old friends, he said, that the census returns shewed how great a mass of people never come under any religious influences. The education given to most of our ministers was a very expensive one, also occupying a long time, and the Home Missionary Board was established in order to train those who were able to address the masses for such a work, without so great an expenditure either of time or money. Ought we not to aid every effort of this kind? We must promote our own views; but while supporting missions, we must each one of us exert ourselves to shew forth in our own lives the truth of our doctrines.

Mr. Gibson thought free inquiry could do harm only among the half-educated; but he had faith in its principles, notwithstanding these evils. To counteract the evils arising from this freedom, he thought missionary effort most necessary, and therefore cordially

supported the vote of sympathy with the Home Missionary Board. It was to direct its labour more especially to working men, with whom he had always felt deep sympathy; and it would be his most useful work to counteract the Secularist tendencies he met among men of that rank.

Mr. Odgers moved: "With the conviction that the welfare of the Western Unitarian Society, and all similar societies, depends largely on the efforts of individual congregations, this meeting cannot separate without recording its grateful sense of the valuable aid rendered by the Bridgewater congregation, both minister and people, during a long series of years, and its earnest desire that the present respected pastor may long follow his predecessors in his course of generous, unsectarian and truly Christian usefulness, regarding the great interests of humanity above all other interests, and encouraged by the cordial co-operation of fellow worshippers and fellow-citizens." There could be no doubt but individual and congregational efforts were needed to make the Society as useful as could be desired. He was glad to speak of the Bridgewater congregation as fulfilling its duties, and spoke in a very kind manner of the minister who at present leads its services.—Mr. Mardon seconded the resolution.

Mr. Browne responded for the congregation and Mr. Steinthal for himself.

Mr. Evans, in proposing that the next annual meeting should be held at Exeter, urged upon members of the Society to do more to make the Society useful in distributing books and tracts.

After this resolution had been seconded by the Rev. Jerom Murch, and a vote of thanks had been passed to the Chairman, the meeting separated, well satisfied with the day's proceedings.

RESIGNATION OF REV. CHAS. WICKSTEED.

The letters which follow relate to the much-deplored retirement of the Rev. Charles Wicksteed. They bear internal evidence of not having been prepared for the general public eye; but they are so deeply interesting, and so honourable both to the Mill-Hill congregation and their pastor, that we venture, without express authority, to print them. The respectful and affectionate regard and gratitude of those who have profited by Mr. Wicksteed's public services (and how various and important they have been!) will, we doubt not, alleviate and

soothe the sadness of his enforced retirement from the labours of the pastoral office.

To the Members of the Mill-Hill Chapel Congregation.

Ilkley, July 7th, 1854.

My beloved Friends,—I approach the most serious and painful action of my life, as I begin to write those lines which are to convey my Farewell to you—which are to resign into your hands that solemn spiritual charge which you have committed to me, and to terminate that ministerial relationship which has for nearly nineteen years subsisted between us.

Nothing, my dear friends, but an imperative necessity, an imperative sense of honour and duty, could have induced me to take and to adhere to this step, in opposition to your earnest and friendly remonstrances, and to your generous and considerate propositions to prevent it. But my idea of the sacred office, which I have endeavoured to fulfil, has been always placed so sadly and so loftily above all that I could realize, even in the periods of my best strength and courage, that now, when enfeebled health has for some time past been increasing the distance between my conception of the duties of this office and my power of fulfilling them, I can no longer think it right to remain under responsibilities, the discharged portions of which having proved too much for my strength, leave the undischarged portions a perpetual and increasing weight upon my conscience and my feelings.

The first intimation of my intention to resign my office as your minister, was, I believe, received by you with surprise, as the only cause which existed for such a step was the state of my health, and that cause did not appear to you sufficient to necessitate such a proceeding. But a fuller acquaintance with the nature of the case has, I believe, convinced many of you of the necessity of the course I have adopted; and were you all as fully aware as my own family have long been of the cost of exertion and exhaustion at which my services (even in a reduced form) have been rendered, there is not one of you who would wish me to continue them.

My residence in the country for two summers, and my journey on the continent last year, were undertaken with a view to avert the necessity of this separation, which I even then felt to be otherwise impending; but though they certainly deferred, they have proved insufficient (as I am convinced all similar temporary relief and remedies would do) to prevent it.

I am anxious that this point should be

understood, as no motive operates with me in resigning my charge, except the absolute necessity of an entire removal, for some years at least, from the duties and the responsibilities of my calling. In confirmation of this, I may now without impropriety mention, that every suggestion and proposal that has reached me from other places to make a change, has been always and at once declined, and would have continued to be so as long as my services met with the general recognition of usefulness among you, which up to this moment I am grateful to say they have done, and as long as my health allowed me to render them with anything like satisfaction to my own feelings, and my own sense of duty.

Nineteen years ago this month, I crossed the hills that separate Lancashire and Yorkshire, and stood among you for the first time, a young man and a stranger. Since that time, how many ties of friendship and affection have gathered round my heart! How many joys, how many sorrows, have we shared together! I leave my dead among you. I leave my heart in your midst. Faithful, affectionate and just have you been to me, and I had hoped to spend my years of activity in your service, my later years of repose and retirement in the enjoyment of your friendship, and to have closed my eyes where I have had my home;—but it is to be otherwise, —and I feel a perfect faith, notwithstanding the clouds and darkness of our present sorrow, that, in the good providence of God, it will be better for us all that it should be so.

From among the whole number of the clergy and ministers of religion now exercising their public functions in Leeds, amounting, I presume, in all to about one hundred, there are now but two who were residing in Leeds when I first came to it. Out of the whole number of seat-holders then attending the chapel, nearly one-half have, during the same period, been carried off by death or ceased to be residents in the town; but notwithstanding these changes around us and among us, we can look with satisfaction and gratitude on the general progress of religion. Both in our own and most other denominations in the town, an increased number of places of worship and of worshipers, of ministers of religion, of institutions of instruction, Christian beneficence and philanthropic exertion, bear witness to the growth of a deeper religious earnestness and an enlarged spirit of beneficent liberality, and to the truth of the encouraging statement, and the value of the reassuring exhortation, “though one generation passeth and

another cometh, yet the earth endureth for ever," and "the Lord reigneth, therefore should the earth rejoice."

During this period, from first to last, I have been connected, as a minister of religion, with between two and three hundred households, scattered often at great distances from each other over this town and neighbourhood, embracing many of the humblest and poorest, as well as some of the highest and richest, in your community. Though varying circumstances, temperaments and requirements, have of course occasioned a variety of intercourse, yet with by far the larger portion of these, occasions of great joy or sorrow, misfortune or tribulation, sickness or bereavement, or, finally, occasions of sin or error, and the suffering entailed by these, have united me by the deepest and warmest feelings of sympathy. While such intercourse and experience sometimes overcharge the heart of an affectionate minister, and lay upon him a weight of anxiety and grief beyond the measure assigned to him in his own individual and personal relations by God, they yet are of so sacred, so affecting, and, I may add, with few and rare exceptions, of so attaching a nature, that humble, or uninteresting, or repulsive even, as the individual with whom he is brought into such relations may appear to others or to the world, to *him* he is the subject of the most tender commiseration and of the truest Christian affection. In addition to these sources of anxiety, and the weight of my public services, and the study and preparation necessary for them, I have no doubt had my discouragements and disappointments, as every man must have who, bearing a kind heart to all, and anxious for their highest welfare, is zealously affected in any good cause, and desires to engage the energy and good-will of all about him in the same.

There are many subjects both of public and congregational, both of personal and social import, on which (had it been in my power again to address you) I should have wished to speak to you before our parting came. But the past must now speak for itself. Indeed, its irrevocable word has already fallen on our ears, as it does upon those of all men. It is ours no longer to amend, or to alter, or to recal. I look back upon it in silent and mingled feeling; and if I find in it some things on which I might congratulate both you and myself, and for which I might invite you to be grateful to God with me, I find many also in which we might all of us have been more faithful to the holy gospel of love and righteousness which we profess, and more true to the maintenance and advo-

eacy of that pure and uncorrupted faith in the One God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, which it is our privilege and honour to hold.

During my illnesses and absences from you, I had thought over several modes of increasing our congregational efficiency and religiousness, and it has been a most painful disappointment to me to find the inability under which my want of strength has placed me to carry them out. I had thought that by means, in part, of some annual and special service, the Lord's Supper might have gathered round it a more profound and extended interest in the congregation at large, and been made an occasion for the younger members of the congregation entering more consciously and seriously upon their duties and obligations as members of a Christian church. I had hoped also to carry out more systematic and continuous theological instruction in classes for the young, and to renew your interest in the boys' Sunday-school, which for the last year and a half has suffered, and I fear partly through my own inefficiency in awakening you to the calls of a duty, which the small portion of time secured on the week-day by parents among the working classes for the education of their children, the necessity of some direct religious instruction for them, and the great importance to the peace and harmony of society of beneficent intercourse between classes so widely separated in their condition as are the rich and poor in this country, render very binding and imperative.

These, however, and other matters of the like kind, I must now leave to the future and to yourselves. May God grant you united hearts, and patient and mutually forbearing dispositions, in proceeding to the choice of him who may now succeed me, and who, I humbly pray the Almighty Father, may be far more to you and yours, to this congregation and to the church universal of Jesus Christ, than he who now, in weakness and in grief, takes as a minister, but not as a friend, his final and affectionate farewell of you. One thing I shall always look back upon with unmixed satisfaction and gratitude. It is your long and generous kindness to me, your forbearance and indulgence towards me, and your earnest and affectionate desire to alleviate my afflictions, and to avert the present distressing separation. I can truly say, in return, that though circumstances may not have called for or admitted, at all times and with all of you, its direct manifestation, I have borne a heart of warm affection towards you, and a sincere desire to serve you. Let me say then to

yourselves, ere I leave you, “Love one another.”

And now, brethren, as I cannot, to the disappointment of my cherished desire, bid you a personal farewell, I command each one of you to the mercies of that Heavenly Father who watcheth over all his children, however separated from each other,—praying for you that ye may be found steadfast in every good work and word, contenders for the pure faith of the gospel, instructors of the ignorant, assertors of human rights and liberties in every place, and alleviators of human sorrows and oppressions,—that “whether I come and see you again, or else be absent from you, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the gospel, and in nothing terrified by your adversaries,” and that God may hereafter gather us all together within the folds of his infinite love in heaven, no wanderer lost.

Your faithful friend,
CHARLES WICKSTEED.

Leeds, July 20th, 1854.

Very Dear and Reverend Sir,—Your letter of the 7th inst., addressed to the members of the Mill-Hill chapel congregation, was read to them at the close of the morning service on the following Sunday, and we have been deputed, as a Committee, to acknowledge its receipt.

Although your previous communications had prepared us for such a result, yet when we read those lines which conveyed your farewell to us, those affecting lines in which you “resigned into our hands that solemn spiritual charge which we had committed to you, and terminated that ministerial relationship which has for nearly nineteen years subsisted between us,” our hearts were moved with deep and unfeigned sorrow.

Happy indeed should we have been, if, by any means, we could have prolonged *that* relationship, and fondly have we clung to the hope that the ties which have so long and so happily bound us together might not be altogether severed; but far from wishing to pain you by any expression of vain regret, we beg you to accept the assurance of our conviction that necessity alone compelled you to take this step, and of our admiration of the high and delicate sense of honour and of duty, which has led you to refuse compliance with our earnest solicitations.

It would not become us on the present occasion to enumerate in detail all the ties which bind us to you so closely and so warmly, and all those claims upon our gratitude to which you are so justly enti-

tled by your long and faithful services. We can make but a passing allusion to those eminent talents which have ever made you conspicuous among the many distinguished ministers of our faith; to the deep learning and fearless research which you have brought to bear upon theological investigation; to the fervent piety combined with charity to all, which have characterized your ministrations; to the interest you have manifested on every occasion to increase the happiness and to elevate the character of your fellow-men; and, lastly, to the unwearied devotion and zeal with which you have discharged all your duties,—a truth which the present delicate state of your health serves but too fully to confirm.

We feel that a heavy debt of gratitude is laid upon us, and earnestly do we hope that this frank and full acknowledgment may in some degree soothe those sad feelings which your high ideal of the sacred office, and your humility in estimating your own realization of it, have led you to avow.

Wherever the requirements of health or the interests of your family may call you, thither will our sympathy and our love follow you. Our earnest prayer to God will ever be, that in his good time he may restore you to the enjoyment of renewed health and strength, and whenever you revisit the scenes of your long and unwearied ministrations, you will be welcomed to our hearts and our homes as a dear and valued friend.

That every earthly blessing may attend you and your family, is the sincere prayer of, dear Sir, your truly affectionate friends,

(Signed on behalf of the Mill-Hill chapel congregation,) J. H. OATES,
JAMES BUCKTON,
J. D. LUCCOCK.

The Rev. Chas. Wicksteed, B.A.,
Minister of Mill-Hill Chapel, Leeds.

WARWICKSHIRE UNITARIAN TRACT SOCIETY.

The forty-eighth annual general meeting of this Society was held in the New meeting-house, Birmingham, on Wednesday, Aug. 23rd. The meeting had been previously announced by an address, distributed under the direction of the Committee, stating that a quarter of a century had elapsed since the last annual meeting in Birmingham, referring to the many changes which had taken place during that period, and expressing the hope that the principles and objects of the Society continued to

recommend themselves to the general approval of the Unitarian public in the town which is the centre of its operations. Nor was this hope disappointed. Notwithstanding the unavoidable absence of several of the leading members of the Unitarian societies in Birmingham, announced to the meeting with expressions of their regret, an unusually large congregation assembled in the New meeting-house at the hour for the religious service, and continued their attendance at the subsequent business proceedings and social union throughout the day.

The religious service was introduced by the Rev. Stephenson Hunter, of Wolverhampton; and the Rev. James Martineau, of Liverpool, preached from 1 Tim. i. 5, "Now the end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." The discourse, which was justly characterized in a subsequent resolution of thanks as "able, eloquent and impressive," and which was listened to throughout with the deepest attention, had reference "less to the metaphysics of the Godhead than to the interests of humanity," being devoted to an exposition of the moral bearings of the popular theory of redemption; and, in contrast with that theory, of what the preacher justly regarded as lying at the very foundation of all human responsibility, viz. the strictly *personal* nature of sin,—the essential evil of which, its penalties and remedy, were most clearly and impressively set forth. We regret that it is not in our power to furnish a complete analysis of this eminently philosophical and practical discourse; the more so, as our confident anticipations that it would be laid before the public, in compliance with the request, once and again urged, of those who heard it, are, for important reasons, disappointed; but we are persuaded that the impression made by the discourse on those who heard it, in favour of the rational and consistent views of God's providence and grace which are characteristic of Unitarian Christianity, is such as will not speedily be effaced.

At the meeting for business which immediately followed, the chair was taken, in kind compliance with the request of the Committee, by Henry Smith, Esq., of Edgbaston. A very handsome donation of £5. 5s. was presented to the Society by the Mayor, James Baldwin, Esq.; and additional annual subscriptions, to the amount of

£6. 15s., were announced from twenty-three new subscribers. The Treasurer's account shewed a balance in hand of £16. 13s. 8d. The catalogue of books and tracts comprised 127 articles, of which 34 were introduced this year; and among them several originating in circumstances of peculiar interest as affecting the maintenance and avowal of Unitarian Christianity in the several localities from which they emanated.

About 120 ladies and gentlemen subsequently dined together, under the continued presidency of Mr. Smith. At the close of the repast, the Chairman, in commencing the proceedings, made some very interesting remarks on the astonishing progress which had been made in civil and religious freedom since the establishment of this Society forty-eight years ago, and expressed the hope that every advocate of the rights of conscience would follow the example of those who had gone before us, in addressing the judgment and not the passions; and that, in whatever we might say, there might be nothing at which reason or charity could take offence; concluding with proposing the usual loyal toasts, which were duly honoured.

In responding to the sentiment, "Civil and Religious Liberty all the World over," which the Chairman in proposing justly designated "the shibboleth of our faith," the Rev. Wm. M'Kean expressed his lively satisfaction in the sense of freedom which he enjoyed from those views of the retributive providence of God which the preacher of the day had so ably illustrated; and then proceeded to remind the meeting of the obligations which civil liberty owed to the Puritans of England and the Covenanters of Scotland for the great advances which it had made.

In replying to a resolution of thanks to the Preacher for his services that day, in proposing which the Chairman had congratulated him on the "world-wide reputation" which he had established, the Rev. James Martineau made some very important remarks on the greatly increased facilities for the publication of our opinions which now exist; animadverting with a just severity on those who would shrink from the open avowal of their convictions, and on the attempt to unite together in one worshiping society those who do not agree on the great principles of faith and morals, which he characterized as an "idle dream." He expressed his high sense of the value of Noncon-

formity, and of the importance of introducing a much larger number of thoughtful and earnest young men into the Christian ministry; and concluded with wishing that the Society might long maintain the reputation and influence it deserved from its very nature, and from the great and noble names with which it was connected.

The Rev. Charles Clarke then proposed, "The universal diffusion and triumph of Christian truth; and honour to those faithful servants of God, ministers and laymen, into whose labours we have entered!"—in connection with which sentiment, he contrasted the truth generally taught, which he characterized as altogether "an ideal thing," with that which nature and the gospel combine to teach; and concluded with illustrating the saying of Milton, that "the truth which we have not digested and which has cost us no expenditure of labour and time, is no truth of ours."

The Rev. Timothy Davis, of Evesham, the oldest member present, proposed, "Prosperity to the Warwickshire Unitarian Tract Society," and greatly interested the meeting by his reminiscences of the time when the last meeting was held in Birmingham.

In proposing "The Congregation of the New Meeting-house and their Minister," the Rev. James Martineau spoke of the antecedents of that church as "more noble than any antiquity," and eulogized the effectual protest which had recently been made by their minister, in conjunction with the minister of the Old meeting-house, against the bigotry with which their opinions had been assailed.

The Chairman, in offering this sentiment to the meeting, could not refrain from expressing his concurrence in every observation which had fallen from Mr. Martineau. He could assure Mr.

Bache that he not only had the respect and affection of his congregation, but enjoyed the confidence and respect of the community at large.

The Rev. Samuel Bache, in acknowledging the kindness thus shewn him, observed, that if there were anything in either the principles or proceedings of the New-Meeting congregation or of the Tract Society, which seemed to him to militate against the largest and noblest principles of religious liberty, that thing must be changed, or his connection with either must cease. "When we refer to our noble ancestors, we do so not as inheriting their opinions, but their principles." He recommended the plans and purpose of the Tract Society, and shewed how great was the work still to be done in teaching men, first, that reason is to be applied to religion as well as to common life, and, secondly, that the Bible is the record of divine revelation, not the revelation itself,—illustrating his observations by reference to the recent local controversy. He dwelt at some length on the importance of shewing still farther the practical uses to which revelation must be applied, and concluded by cordially thanking them for the kind and encouraging sympathy with him which they had expressed.

The Rev. Stephenson Hunter spoke very forcibly on the great importance of Education, and the necessity for its continual improvement and extension.

A resolution was then passed acknowledging the efficient services of the Stewards, and especially of Mr. William Lowe, Jun., their Secretary; after which the proceedings of this animated and encouraging meeting terminated by a cordial vote of thanks to the Chairman, for the ability and kindness with which he had presided over the whole business of the day.

OBITUARY.

July 27, at her residence, Clifton, Mrs. KENTISH, widow of the late Dr. Kentish. She was the third daughter of Robert Rankin, Esq., of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and came to Bristol on her marriage, in the year 1804. In that city and its neighbourhood, she resided during the long period of half a century, beloved and respected by a large circle of friends, many of whom remain to mourn her loss. She was a member of Lewin's Mead chapel, and engaged in its services and sustained its insti-

tutions with an earnestness and a constancy and zeal which are not commonly seen. She can no longer unite with fellow-worshipers in prayer and praise. Her place in the sanctuary is vacant, and her face upon earth will be seen no more. But the influence of her beautiful example and her Christian life cannot die, and her memory will be long and reverently cherished. Descended from Nonconformist ancestors, she remained consistently attached to the cause which she had been early

trained to value, and to which, from conviction, she was led to give an intelligent and faithful adherence. In her youth, Unitarian doctrines were much discussed, in consequence of the indefatigable labours of Dr. Priestley. Her views of religious truth were, on most points, in accordance with those of that great and good man. To her mind, they appeared to be in harmony both with reason and scripture. She found them set forth in the clear and positive teaching of Christ and his apostles, and she believed them to be sufficient for the spiritual wants of the soul. Feeling their importance herself, she rejoiced in their diffusion amongst others, whilst she held them in a spirit of the broadest catholicity and charity.

Eminently retiring in her habits and gentle in her demeanour, Mrs. Kentish was always ready, whilst health and strength remained, to engage in any work of benevolence where she felt that she could be usefully employed. In the Schools and Working and Visiting Society connected with the Lewin's Mead congregation, she was long actively employed, with those who will never forget her sympathy with the poor, her self-forgetfulness and her generosity. There are not a few who could bear grateful testimony to acts of kindness, to thoughtful, continuous attention and aid from her, which have contributed to their moral and social welfare, and for which they will ever have reason to be thankful. She emphatically shewed, indeed, how possible it is for a Christian woman, without any distinguished gifts either of mind or fortune, to find abundant employment for her leisure in works of unostentatious benevolence, and to do good to others in a hopeful, trusting, loving spirit.

On the hearts of those who knew her most intimately, and who were best able to appreciate her cheerful temper, her serene faith, and the sterling excellence of her character, the virtues of the subject of this obituary notice are traced. When sickness came, and the hand of death was upon her, she was tranquil and happy,—looking with confidence to her Father in heaven, and feeling safe in his care. Throughout her trying and protracted illness, there was a sweet and submissive spirit of implicit faith and patience—the result of established piety and devotion—which shed a calm and almost heavenly peace around her. She had not to seek the consolations and supports of religion, but to *enjoy* them, in her season

of trial and affliction. Without growing weary of life, she was ready to go, nor for a moment doubted that God's time was the best time for her departure. To the last, when she was able to see her relatives and friends, she delighted in their society. And when at length she heard the voice from on high calling her home, she quietly bowed her head and said, “The will of the Lord be done!” To her, it cannot be doubted the change has been a happy one. And those who mourn her loss, can look forward to a re-union with her in that better world where no tears are shed, and the pang of separation is not known.

July 30, EMILY, the wife of Mr. Harry Rawson, of Manchester, at the age of 30 years.

Early has the young wife and mother been removed from her family and the world. Her husband, between whom and herself existed a most cordial affection,—her children, too young as yet to comprehend the value of a mother's love and the tender cares it prompts,—behold her no more. There is a vacant seat in their dwelling. There is a void in many hearts that loved her. The event draws largely on our faith. We see not why this separation should take place so soon. In our narrow vision, it is premature. We look on the infants whom she tends no longer, and we ask, Why is it thus? But that Wisdom which directs all events, has its own purposes to answer—beneficent purposes too—and human experience and religion unite to induce us to trust in it. The reasons may be inscrutable, but a future day will disclose them, and we may then learn that this present affliction was essential to the production of ultimate good,—a dark spot but to diversify life's brightness, and to make that brightness more beautiful.

Mrs. Rawson married early and happily; for mutual affection cemented the union, and pleasing prospects opened upon it. Hers was the disposition, hers the affections, which render home endeared and happy. There her chief interests centred and her most earnest cares. Young to fulfil some of the most important duties of life, she proved herself equal to them as they increased upon her; and it was to be seen that she felt her responsibilities, and was anxious that she might not fail to meet them. But this evidence was gathered, not from any display of her own—from the genuine simplicity of her character. All was natural and guileless. Quietly,

calmly, affectionately, she fulfilled the daily trust committed to her by Heaven, unconscious that others were observant of her merits, and anxious only to be simply right and faithful, and to obey the dictates of her own kind heart. Religion, in the same beautiful simplicity, revealed itself in her daily life, the centre gem of all her virtues; and we may lament—still submissive to the Divine will—that it is no longer her duty and privilege to communicate her own religious spirit to the minds of her children. Gentle and faithful a wife and mother was she; and if sorrow becomes deeper and intenser as her gentleness and faithful affection pass before his mind who laments her loss the most, yet should it be soothed by as deep a conviction that her virtues, so far from being extinguished for ever, will increase in beauty, and her affections become more pure and hallowed towards all who love her. Unseen, it may be given her to sympathize with those she has left: her spirit may be with theirs, although no human eye can behold so saintly a communion.

On the evening of the Sabbath, Emily looked upon earthly things for the last time, and the sacred calmness of that evening was not more calm than her spirit's final departure. She died as she had lived—meekly, hopefully. In the closing scene of her life, there was a lesson which many should learn. Her sufferings were borne in humble resignation to the will of God. No murmurs escaped her that her days were numbered so soon. No vain regrets harassed her spirit that the joys of life had been to her so brief. Nor were the feelings of those who waited around her dying bed wounded by any impulse of impatience, for which weakness and pain might indeed plead an excuse. She was more considerate for them than for herself, receiving their attentions in the spirit in which they were offered. The last throbings of her heart were for them. Her religious principles were now tried, and they were not found wanting. Gazing into the mysterious future, she felt no fear. Her hope and trust were in God. The same hope and trust which had elevated her soul in the days of health and joy, waited upon her to bless her departure. Hoping, trusting, she gave herself to God, and “sank to rest as a child falls asleep in the arms of a tender parent.”

Peaceful be her rest! Peaceful *will* be that rest, and happy the awaking. A life so innocent, so meekly good, can

only close in one world to open again with higher attributes in another. The hopes which have been crushed here revive with a more glorious promise, and the affections whose genial flow has been chilled by death, be set free by the sun of immortality, and with a fuller and purer tide enrich re-united hearts for ever.

It is our painful duty to record the death of the Rev. SAMUEL WALKER, of Bristol. The life of men eminent for their virtues does not always abound in striking incidents, nor gratify the mere love of novelty; but there is a pensive satisfaction in the attempt to portray their character, and a lesson in it not the less attractive and impressive by reason of the calm beauty which it presents to the eye of contemplation.

Mr. Walker was the second son of the Rev. Sayer Walker, and born at Enfield, in Middlesex, on the 29th March, 1780. At this time the father was minister of an influential congregation at that place, and he continued his ministrations there until a physical defect obliged him to relinquish them. He subsequently removed to London, and as a physician was honourably distinguished by his connection with some of the public institutions of the metropolis, as well as by his private practice. His death occurred at Clifton in 1826.

In early life, his son Samuel shewed no particular predilection for the ministry. His education, therefore, was adapted to mercantile pursuits. First in Ware, and afterwards in the metropolis, the usual studies were pursued, and then he was placed in a merchant's counting-house. Thus far embarked in life, he soon manifested a steadiness of character and fixedness of principle not too common in youth,—secured the confidence of his employers, and was charged with duties beyond his age and experience, which were assiduously and ably performed. At the usual time, he engaged in business on his own account; but prosperous fortune did not wait upon him; the judgment and the integrity which had previously distinguished him not always securing pecuniary profit. After some interval of time, his mind turned towards the ministry. For this, his usual reading had in some degree prepared him, if it had not indeed originated the desire to aim at usefulness in such a vocation. From his childhood, the books he preferred were those of a serious and, still more, of a religious character. To the study of these, much of his leisure time

was always devoted, with great advantage, not only to himself, but to others. Still he was not content with these acquisitions. Choosing the ministry as a profession, he devoted much time and care to the preparation for it, and then sought a situation in which he might realize the usefulness to which he aspired. The pulpit at Crewkerne being at this juncture vacant, he accepted a cordial invitation to occupy it. This connection was formed at the commencement of the year 1824, and continued until 1839, a period of fifteen years. Mr. Walker then removed to the neighbourhood of the metropolis, giving occasional assistance at Hackney and elsewhere, during the few months that intervened between his first and second settlement. At the close of the same year, he undertook the charge of the Frenchay congregation, and continued to devote his powers to its service for the ensuing twelve years of his life. The circle of human exertion is limited; and Providence saw fit to put a close to the useful activities in which Mr. Walker had delighted. In the year 1851, he found himself disabled from continuing his services to the Frenchay congregation by an attack of paralysis. Unwilling to be deprived of these services, it kindly deferred appointing a successor, in the hope that he might resume his labours. But the hope was not justified by the event. The first attack was followed by others, which left such excessive weakness as made it impossible that he could appear in the pulpit again.

Thus separated from public usefulness, our deceased friend, if he were to instruct at all, must teach within the confines of the sick chamber. There he continued to evince the value, as he had openly done, of the patient endurance of suffering, and the efficacy of a rational, deep-fixed piety. This sustained his soul when other supports were falling away from him. To him, the blow which laid him aside must have been severe,—his estrangement from the duties he had honourably performed, a bitter deprivation; but he bore the change with an equal temper and an uncomplaining spirit. On his lips there was no murmur,—in his heart there was no rebel emotion wrestling with his deep convictions of the wisdom and beneficence of God. True is it that

“The chamber where a good man meets his fate,
Is privileged beyond the common walk of life.”

There our friend continued to set forth the power of Christian piety, and there he resigned his spirit in the presence of those who had watched him with unremitting attention and tenderness, and loved him with strong affection. The trials through which he had passed, and these were deeper than the common eye took note of; the sufferings which marked a long period of increasing weakness and decay, were now ended. He expired on the 7th of August. In the Brunswick-Square cemetery of Bristol, his last remains are deposited. There, in the vault of the Jillard family, the father and the son rest together.

We have not to append to this brief and simple sketch the record of grand achievements to excite an ephemeral wonder. The life of Christ’s faithful ministers generally consists of unpretending efforts to enlarge his kingdom, varied by self-known trials. That of the departed presents no contrast to it. His great anxiety was simply and earnestly to occupy the station of usefulness to which his consistent desires led him, and to train the minds which enjoyed his culture to a truthful and hopeful Christianity. To him, mere popularity appeared to be of very little value, and he struggled not to secure it. But it was of great importance that the offices of religion should be administered in their impressiveness and sanctity; that the morality of the gospel should be enforced, whilst its sublime doctrines were not thrown into the shade; that the worshiper should be made deeply sensible of the obligations under which he lay to the Great Being he worshiped; and these were the topics on which he plainly and without pretence insisted. He came somewhat late in life to the ministry, as if he had only changed the scene of his exertions. The writer of this sketch well remembers the impression made by his first discourse on a public occasion,—the approbation expressed of the argument of that discourse, and the style in which it was maintained. These made it evident that, if he was new to the duties of the pulpit, his mind had long been trained to those exercises and informed with that knowledge which render them truly efficient. It was permitted him for a large number of years thus to serve the great cause to which he was attached: and are there not many on which his ministry, thus simply and earnestly exercised, wrought with a silent efficacy, and who can still rejoice that they possessed the advantages of

his public services and his private sympathy and friendship?

The friend of the poor is the friend of humankind, and such was our revered friend. He was well aware of the privations to which this large class of society is exposed. Whether he speculated upon the causes of them, or inquired whether they should exist, is beside our purpose: he was deeply sensible of their existence, and, as far as his power extended, applied to them a practical remedy. Both by duty and inclination, he felt bound to assist those who have few earthly friends to assist them, by counsel and by pecuniary aid endeavouring to remove some of their burdens and to supply some of their wants; thus acting as the almoner of the great Lord who places talents in the hands of his agents, that they may bring a blessing to the homes and hearts of others. The recollection of his kindness and assistance, unostentatiously and unselfishly extended, warms even now more than a few grateful hearts.

It will have been anticipated that a man such as we have described would be true and faithful to the various relations of private life. His parents were gratified by his dutiful behaviour, and for his father was reserved the additional pleasure of knowing that his public conduct was as worthy of his esteem and love as his private had been. The affliction which has fallen upon the near friends who survive him, is softened by the remembrance of his strong affection for them, and the uniform expression of it which they received. The domestic virtues were his own. At home, the unstudied kindness of his heart rose above the occasional reserve which was perhaps constitutional. There his affability and gentlemanly courtesy revealed and honoured the high principles by which he was uniformly governed. It is as true as it is meritorious, that selfishness was foreign to his spirit. Nor was the opposite virtue a late acquirement. In early life, he expressed a generous concern for others, and the generosity thus adorning his youth only changed as his life was extended by advancing into greater strength and vitality.

Splendid talents raise up for their possessor a temporary renown, although his earthly course is perhaps as erratic as it is brilliant. The good man leaves to posterity a name that is longer remembered; or if it be not, there is still a fame associated with it that can never die. The influences of his virtues,

moreover, are more extensive than is to be ascertained from the measure of the orbit in which he has moved. No one can tell how his virtues have elicited kindred virtues in the breasts of others, and these again performing in their turn the same generous office, and all sustaining and extending a moral power, as the breath of heaven raises wave after wave upon the surface of the transparent lake. The offices of the ministry, however coldly looked upon by some, and thought to be almost the grave of talents which should figure in the world, are fully congenial to the virtues in which Christianity delights, and enough to gratify a wise ambition; and when they are honourably maintained, are productive of the highest earthly good. By the deceased, they were honourably maintained. Actuated by a right spirit, he moved in a right course. To fulfil his Master's will, was the ruling desire of his life. To be a faithful minister of the gospel, was his great aim. And his exertions were without self-laudation—his zeal without personal interests. He was content to maintain the even tenor of his way, avoiding all ostentation, subduing all love of applause, quietly implanting the seeds of goodness and holiness in the minds of his disciples, and inscribing his name, if it might be so, upon their hearts.

If it were possible that such a man could live unesteemed and die unlauded, and even he be content to find amongst humankind this quick oblivion, there is a record, nevertheless, which forbids the wrong. Omniscience is ever awake, and the pen of the Eternal inscribes the virtues of his rational offspring upon memorials that time destroys not. In this keeping is the departed minister of Christ's gospel, and he will not fail to shed upon his modest virtues an eternal lustre. In the hope of this, may his sorrowing friends find consolation and even joy! May his example, contrasting so beautifully as it does with the false glare of earthly renown, attract the regard of those whose race of life is still unmeasured! For himself, the trial is over, and the reward awaits him. And whilst illustrious vice shall cower before the eye of the Judge, and wasted talent blush to render an account, his shall be the conscious satisfaction of having been humbly instrumental to the triumph of goodness and religion upon earth, and to the full, immortal revelation of their beauty in heaven.